THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL
OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume VII JUNE, 1921 Number 3

AN ELEMENTARY COLLEGE COURSE IN SPEAKING

EDWIN G. FLEMMING*
Madison, Wisconsin

INTRODUCTION

Aims of Students and Teachers of Speech

STUDENTS take the elementary course in speaking from various motives. A very small percentage of them desire to become public speakers. Some of them take the course because one of their professors advised them to take it, thinking that such a course would help the student to make better recitations in his classes. Some students say they want to learn "to think on their feet," not realizing that they can not think at all. Others want to holp up their end of a conversation. All shades and varieties of reasons are given why students take "speaking."

The purposes or aims of teachers of Speech are just as varied, and in many cases as sensible, as those given by the students. Some there are who want to make public speakers (thanks be, they are few); one professor said his purpose was to make fewer public speakers, and was straightway misunderstood. Others have said that they wish to educate the men and women in their classes through the medium of speech training. And some have declared they want to teach the youth to think.

Of course we want to do all these things. But how can we be so general in our statements and get anywhere? The purpose of a doctor is to make people well, or keep them well; but before he can do that he must know whether there is anything the matter, what is specifically required to make them well or to keep them well. He does not give them all the same treatment. There are

* Formerly of the Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin

certain laws of health which we must all observe; but there are a certain few which each individual must take especial pains to observe; nor does everyone have the same difficulties in maintaining his health.

Some teachers of Speech maintain that the only way to learn to speak is to speak; to learn to think is to try it. Others have discovered certain fundamental principles, which they call the "elements of speech" and insist upon teaching to every student. They teach him how to breathe, how to relax, how to make well rounded tones, how to count to one hundred or recite the ABCs with varying expressions of surprise, anger, pathos, and love. Although there is merit in all these methods and each gets results, yet they are not adequate nor efficient. Some students can think; some can get up before an audience and speak fairly well; some students do breathe properly; some are not over tense; some can express emotions at will. The blanket instruction does not and can not fit the groups of students who ordinarily come together in any given class.

Any and all instruction should have for its purpose to enable the student to re-adapt himself as easily as may be to the varying circumstances of life in which he happens to find himself. In order to accomplish that the teacher must know the material with which he is working. He must not only know his subject, and man in general, but he must know the individuals, each individual he is intending to instruct, if he is to give the student the maximum amount of benefit. Not only must he know him, but he must know him as thoroughly and as soon in the term as possible.

An Analysis of the Problem

The purpose of an elementary course in speech should be to build up that part of each student's speech reaction which is weak, besides giving him a knowledge of the fundamentals of good speaking, and much opportunity to improve his speech reactions through practise. The fundamental factors in speech may be indicated as follows;—intelligence, emotional reactions, co-ordination, and ability to read silently.

Intelligence is fundamental, because without a certain amount of intelligence progress is limited. This, however, the teacher cannot improve; but knowing the student's intelligence he can better measure his limitations and help him to use most effectively the in-

telligence he has. If a student has emotional inhibitions, development cannot occur until those inhibitions are either lessened or removed; and to accomplish this most effectively the teacher must discover their cause. Training in the so-called elements cannot in such a case transfer to a real speech situation, nor to any other situation that the student must meet in life, unless the cause of the inhibitions has been removed. Coördination of the mind and body are necessary that the person may be able to make his body respond to his mental and emotional stimuli; that he may be able to do or say exactly what he desires. Silent reading ability is of importance since the speaker must needs get his ideas from the printed page; he can not be an original investigator in all fields of knowledge. If he is to be able to convey the thoughts of others, he must be able to read and comprehend the thoughts of others. The importance of some instruction in silent reading was revealed in an experiment with students taking courses in public speaking in the University of Wisconsin, the results of which were published in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION, November, 1920, Vol. VI, No. 4, pages 31-51.

Preliminary Considerations

The following outline of a course in elementary public speaking is designed to meet, so far as is practicable, the needs of the individual student. A single class will be carried through a period of fifteen weeks, meeting three times a week. Because of the great amount of work necessary with individuals, a maximum of twelve hours for an instructor is essential. Nine hours would be advisable. The class should be limited to eighteen.

It should be remembered in carrying out this suggested program, that the private appointments with the students are of vital importance. After the "inventory" made by the teacher during the first four weeks of the term, private appointments should be continued throughout the term with students who especially need help. The instructor can facilitate matters somewhat by meeting two or three students at a time who have the same difficulties and need the same special attention or instruction; but care must be taken to keep the groups very small so that each individual may get personal attention at each meeting, and that all may profit by the instruction. The instructor should avoid having one or two students standing

about while he is attending to one, especially if what is being said or done at a given moment in one case has no direct application to the others.

Each class will be different from the others in the number of students requiring special attention; and each case will vary in the kinds of special instruction and in the amount which will be necessary. For that reason no specific notes on special instruction can be included in the outline of the course. If a student has a particularly difficult personal problem, he can be relieved of some of the class work, and be given a final grade on the basis of progress made in overcoming his individual difficulty.

Throughout the whole course the instructor should bear in mind that his aim is individual instruction to meet individual needs, in so far as the organization of the school curriculum will permit.

If the instructor finds that one or two students have no especial problems; if he finds that a few students are possessed of excellent intelligence, that they read well as indicated by the Thorndike Scale, that they have no emotional inhibitions, that they breathe adequately, that they evidence good coördination, it might be advisable to remove them to the next course in the curriculum that is designed to follow the elementary course. If a student is above the average by being normal in his speech reactions, there isn't much sense in retarding his progress by making him mark time with a group of students who need to be re-educated in order to have normal speech reactions.

Materials to be Used in Each Class of Eighteen

To be furnished by the student.

I. One copy of a good standard text on speaking.

II. A quantity of 8 x 10 typewriter paper on which to make outlines and reports.

III. About a half dozen 4 x 6 unruled cards on which to make reports of time spent in exercising at home.

To be furnished by the instructor.

I. One copy of a good standard text on speaking.

II. One mimeographed copy of each of eighteen short poems.

III. Eighteen mimeographed copies of each of six short prose selections of non-dramatic literature, about 250 words in length.

IV. Eighteen mimeographed copies of each of eleven simple prose selections which will be difficult to read silently in five minutes. These should be chosen with a view to increasing difficulty of subject matter gradually from first to the eleventh. The first selections should be very simple and very easily comprehended. The danger is to make them too difficult at first rather than too simple. These are for use in the reading tests on the third day of each week, from the fourth to the fourteenth inclusive. In rewriting the passage from memory the student should use the back of the sheet.

Also eighteen mimeographed copies of five questions on each selection, with spaces provided for the insertion of answers, to be used in the weekly reading tests. Questions should be of such a nature that they can easily be answered in a word, a short phrase or a sentence.

V. Eighteen copies of an intelligence test with one set of directions and key to correct answers,—The Theisen-Flemming Classification Test,† one of the Thorndyke College Entrance Tests,† or the Otis Group Intelligence Test.*

VI. Thirty-six copies of the Thorndyke Scale Alpha 2, Part II, for measuring the understanding of sentences, with one set of directions and key to correct answers.†

VII. Eighteen or more 4 x 6 ruled cards on which to keep the class records and criticisms of the students.

VIII. Eighteen or more 5 x 8 ruled cards on which to record the history of each student.

Outline of Course

First Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Explain the purpose of the course as being to meet the needs of the individual student. Close coöperation between the students and instructor will therefore be necessary. The student should be made to understand that the instructor does not intend to be a task master, and that as soon as a student shows a lack of interest, or a

* Published by The World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y., or 2126 Prairie Ave., Chicago.

† Published by Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

tendency to take the course as a "snap," he will be left delightfully to his own devices. The student will be expected to make progress. If he comes with some ability he is expected to progress, even though at the beginning he may have less difficulty than the average of the class. Final grades will be made on the basis of conscientious effort and actual progress, as well as on the basis of performance and the final examination.

Have the students write out their reasons for taking the course, asking them to write as fully as possible, as you will endeavor to meet the desires of each one of them.

Call for four volunteers to speak at the next meeting of the class. Speeches should be extempore and not less than five minutes in length.

Assignment.

Each student is to hand in at the next meeting of the class an outline, abstract, or report on an assigned reading dealing with the practical application of speaking as an ability—frequently the first chapter in the standard texts.

First Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.

Volunteer speeches as arranged for on first day should be given with the speaker standing in front of the class, either on or off the platform as suits the individual. The instructor should note in writing on a 4″ x 6″ ruled card for each student particularly the emotional reactions of the students speaking—trembling, husky voices, poor breathing, broken rhythm, etc. Do not criticise either the speakers or the speeches.

Allow the class to discuss the subject matter of each speech for a few minutes, either directly after each speech or after all the speakers have finished, with the purpose of securing an atmosphere af ease. Do not at any time during the course allow the students to criticise each other's delivery; avoid at all times a critical atmosphere.

Call for four more volunteers for the next class period.

Assignment.

For the next meeting each student is to prepare an outline, abstract or report on an assigned reading, which discusses the relation of conversation to speaking—or "conversational quality."

First Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.
Volunteer speeches. Proceed as at the last meeting.
Call for four more volunteers for the next meeting.

Assignment.

None.

Second Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Volunteer speeches. Proceed as on the previous days.
Call for four more volunteers.
Post a schedule for the first round of speeches to begin the first day of the fourth week and continue two weeks, three speeches each day, each speech to be five minutes in length.
Three subjects should be submitted in writing by each student ten days before the date scheduled to speak; and one should be approved by the instructor at that time.
An outline in proper form is to be handed in on the day of speaking.
Students should not be allowed to use notes while speaking.

Assignment.

At the third meeting of the second week each student is to hand in an outline, abstract, or report on an assigned reading dealing with the problems of choosing a subject and finding material.

Second Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Proceed as on the previous days, with volunteer speeches.
The remaining two students will be expected to speak at the next meeting.

Assignment.

None.

Second Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Collect abstracts of the assigned reading.

Volunteer speeches. Proceed as on the previous days.

Take the last half of the period to discuss all the speeches of the students made thus far in a general way.

Discuss *conventional quality,* distinguishing between conversational quality and conversational style, and emphasizing *a lively sense of communication.*

Assignment.

At the second meeting of the third week each student is to hand in an abstract of an assigned reading which discusses the differences and advantages of extempore speeches and memorized speech, and another passage on outlining.

Third Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Give the class an intelligence test,—the Theisen-Flemming Classification Test, one of the Thorndyke College Entrance Tests, or the Otis Group Intelligence Test. Any of these tests will take about fifty minutes, so be sure to begin on time.

Assignment.

None.

Third Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Give the class The Thorndyke Scale Alpha 2, Part II, for measuring the understanding of sentences. This will take twenty minutes, exclusive of directions.

Discuss outlining and give the students a model outline to follow.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.

Assignment.

None.

Third Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Discuss with the students the results of the two tests, explaining to them that the purpose is to give the instructor a better knowledge of their individual needs.

Announce that henceforth each student will be required to keep a record of the number of pages he reads at a sitting; the length of time it takes him to read that number of pages; and the type of material read, i. e., technical matter, history, current fiction, etc. These records should be handed in at the first meeting of each week. This applies to all the reading the student does.

The purpose of such a requirement is to make the student aware of his speed of reading, and to stimulate him to read more rapidly silently in such cases where he is slow.

When it is found that a student does not do much reading, he should be stimulated to increase the amount of time spent in reading.

Make a private appointment with each student, the appointment to be for an hour. Get those students first, so far as possible, who have the greatest emotional inhibitions while speaking, as observed during the volunteer speeches.

At the time of the appointment get a complete history if possible of the student, covering the following points:—

I. General impression of student—tall or short, stout or thin, color, controlled or uncontrolled, tense or phlegmatic, light or dark, tidy or careless, etc.

II. Student's speech condition—fast, slow or broken rhythm, modulation, inflection, change of pitch, quality of tone, resonance, volume, specific defect, stutter, oral inactivity, spasms, ticks, blocking, stoppage, repetition of syllables or words, breathing, etc.

III. Family history. Strive to find the reason for nervous temperament in heredity. Age of father, business, whether or not skillful with his hands, graceful or awkward, character of father's speech, general temperament of father. Same information for mother whether living or dead. Whether either parent was left handed, or whether they were changed. The same information for brothers and sisters. Have any of the children nervous temperaments or suffer from headaches?

IV. Student's history. Where born, well baby or sickly, serious sickness in childhood, age when started to school, how did he get along in school, when he left school, how he got along in high school or in university, does he find it hard to adjust himself in classes and work, general mood and temperament, does he belong to clubs, engage in athletics, is he a good mixer, what are his ideals, what does he like best in the way of amusement or work, what is his general health?

V. Speech history. Age at first walking and talking, does he or did he have night terrors, timid or fearful, right or left handed, can he dance, awkward or graceful, does he play any musical instrument, ever had a speech defect, when did it develop, what has been its progress, has he had intermissions of speech defect, has it changed from one type to another, has he taken any treatment for the defect, what was the result, what effect does the speech defect have upon his work at school, how far does the student think the speech defect affects his emotional life, and how far does he think his emotional life affects his speech?

The history should then be summarized in three or four clear and brief lines, preferably written in red ink.

Give the student such suggestions as at the time and in the particular case seem necessary. Make second and even third and fourth appointments in cases that give especial difficulty; and make other appointments from time to time as deemed necessary for the best individual development.

Assignment.

None.

Fourth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Take the first portion of the period for exedcises for relaxation. Give the students a form on a 4″ x 6″ card on which they are to record the time spent each day in taking the exercises at home. The card should have 28 sections providing for a record of each day's exercising for four weeks. Students should practise from 5 to 15 minutes each day. Caution them to be honest about the record, as they can not expect to get results unless they are con-

scientious in their efforts, and that the progress they make will depend upon the actual time spent in exercising and not upon how much their cards say they spent. Regularity is most essential; to exercise five minutes every day is more helpful than to exercise an hour on Monday, a half hour on Wednesday and not again for two weeks. Relaxation exercises will be indicated on the cards by "R."

Devote the second portion of the period to three extempore speeches. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Post the schedule for the second round beginning the first day of the sixth week. For this round each student is to bring a selection, either prose or poetry, to read before the class. The selections shoould be about five minutes long.

Assignment.

None.

Fourth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Take the first portion of the period for exercises for relaxation.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speeches at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Fourth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

During the second portion of the period give the students a mimeographed selection to read silently, which will be difficult to get through in five minutes. Give them five minutes to reproduce the selection. Give them five minutes to answer five specific questions on the passage, which can be answered in a word or in a short phrase or sentence.

The purpose of this and subsequent tests is to improve their speed and comprehension in silent reading.

Assignment.

None.

Fifth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Take the first portion of the period for breathing exercises. Require the students to take these exercises at home, combining them with those for relaxation, and indicating the time spent in breathing opposite "B" on the report cards.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Assignment.

None.

Fifth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Take the first portion of the period for breathing and relaxation exercises.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Fifth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Take the first portion of the period for extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speeches at the end of the period.

During the second portion of the period give the students a second mimeographed selection to read silently, which will be difficult to get through in five minutes. State that reading exercise (as of Fourth Week, Third Day) is to be repeated. Give them five minutes more to answer five specific questions on the passage, which can be answered in a word or a short phrase or sentence.

Assignment.

At the next meeting of the class each student is to hand in an outline, abstract, or report on an assigned reading covering the relations of speaker to audience.

Sixth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.

During the first portion of the period give the students exercises in voice production. Require them to include these in their home exercises and indicate the time spent on them by "V."

Devote the second portion of the period to oral reading from the printed page as scheduled Fourth Week, First Day. Criticise the reading at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Sixth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing and voice production.

Devote the second portion of the period to oral reading from the printed page as scheduled. Criticise the reading at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Sixth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to oral reading from the printed page as scheduled. Criticise the reading at the end of the period.

During the second portion of the period give the students a third mimeographed selection to read silently, which will be difficult to get through in five minutes. Give them five minutes to reproduce the selection. Give them five minutes more to answer five specific questions, which can be answered in a word, or in a short phrase or sentence.

Assignment.

At the next meeting of the class each student is to hand in an outline, abstract, or report on assigned reading covering the speaker and the audience.

Seventh Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.

During the first portion of the period give the students gesture exercises, for the purpose of securing smoothness and ease of movement. These exercises are to be indicated on the report cards by "G", and should be practised at home along with the others.

Devote the second portion of the period to oral reading from the printed page as scheduled. Criticise the reading at the end of the period.

Assignment.

At the next meeting of the class each student is to hand in an outline, abstract, or report of an assigned reading which discusses the control of the emotion, the theory of emotion and its application for the speaker, and the relation of emotion and imagination.

Seventh Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to oral reading from the printed page as scheduled. Criticise the reading at the end of the period.

Assignment.

At the next meeting of the class each student is to hand in an abstract, outline, or report on an assigned reading covering gesture, its uses, and methods of cultivation.

Seventh Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned readings on gesture.

Devote the first portion of the period to oral reading from the printed page as scheduled. Criticise the reading at the end of the period.

During the second portion of the period give the students a silent reading test as on the third day of the preceding weeks.

Remind the students that the records of home exercising are due at the next meeting, as well as the records of home silent reading.

Assignment.

At the next meeting each student is to hand in an abstract, outline, or report on an assigned reading which treats of phrasing, centering, pause, inflection, etc.

Eighth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Collect the records of home exercising.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading.

Post a schedule for the third round to begin on the first day of the tenth week and to run over two weeks.

Speeches are to be five minutes in length.

Ten days before the student is scheduled to speak he is to submit in writing three subjects, one of which is to be approved at that time.

Each student is to make an appointment with the instructor, to be had at least three days before he is scheduled to speak, for the purpose of discussing the student's outline. The student should bring with him to the conference what he considers to be a finished outline in good form.

The final, corrected outline is to be handed in at the time of speaking.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

During the second portion of the period have the students read at sight a poetical selection—not very long. Work with the reading in detail, paying particular attention to thought getting and phrasing, and stimulate them to give themselves up to emotional expression.

Assignment.

None.

Eighth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

During the second portion of the period drill the students in reading poetry at sight, as at the previous meeting. Use the same selections, giving each student a selection other than the one he had the last time.

Assignment.

None.

Eighth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Announce a one-hour examination for the third meeting of the ninth week.

During the first portion of the period give a silent reading test as in previous cases.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading poetry at sight—each student to have a selection he had not had before.

Assignment.

None.

Ninth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading poetry at sight—each student to have a selection he did not have before.

Assignment.

None.

Ninth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading poetry at sight.

Assignment.

None.

Ninth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Give a one hour examination on the text, with special emphasis on Conversational Quality and Outlining.

Tenth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

During the second portion of the period call for three extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Tenth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

During the second portion of the period have extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Tenth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

During the second portion of the period give a silent reading test as on previous occasions.

Assignment.

At the next meeting each student is to hand in an abstract, outline, or report on an assigned reading which treats of the expository speech.

Eleventh Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the records of home silent reading.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned readings.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

During the second portion of the period have extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Eleventh Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Eleventh Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Remind the students that the records of home exercising are due at the next meeting as well as the records of home silent reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to extempore speeches as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

During the second portion of the period give a silent reading test as on former occasions.

Assignment.

At the next meeting each student is to hand in an abstract, outline, or report on an assigned reading, treating of influencing conduct.

Twelfth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the reports of home silent reading.

Collect the reports of home exercising.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading on influencing conduct.

Post a schedule for the final round of speeches to begin on the first day of the fourteenth week, and to run through two weeks, three speeches each day. Speeches are to be five minutes in length.

Three subjects are to be presented in writing ten days before the student is scheduled to speak, one of which will be approved by the instructor.

At the time of speaking the student is to hand in a final outline, and a list of sources consulted,—whether professors, books or magazines.

Announce that during the next four weeks each student is to have a half-hour appointment with the instructor. At the time of the appointment the instructor should try to get some idea of, and make a written note of, the progress the student has made in overcoming his difficulties—relaxation, breathing, tone production, etc.

Let the student know what progress you thing he has made and what difficulties, if any, he still has to overcome, and upon which he ought to work during the next year or two even though he is not taking a course for credit.

During the first portion of the period give exercises in relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading a prose selection of non-dramatic literature. Each student should have a copy of the same selection. Drill on thought getting, phrasing, em-

phasis, communication, and, if the selection require it, emotional expression.

Assignment.

None.

Twelfth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading drill on a prose selection of non-dramatic literature, each student to have the same selection. Do not use the same selection that was used at the last meeting.

Assignment.

None.

Twelfth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to silent reading test as previously given.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading drill on a third prose selection of non-dramatic literature.

Assignment.

At the next meeting each student is to hand in an abstract, outline or report of an assigned reading treating further of influencing conduct, with emphasis on common ground and the identification of beliefs.

Thirteenth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the abstracts of the assigned reading on influencing conduct.

Collect the reports on home silent reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading drill on a fourth prose selection of non-dramatic literature.

Assignment.

None.

Thirteenth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to reading drill on a fifth selection of non-dramatic prose.

Assignment.

None.

Thirteenth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

During the first portion of the period give the weekly reading test.

Devote the rest of the period to reading drill on a sixth prose selection of non-dramatic literature.

Assignment.

None.

Fourteenth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the reports on home silent reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Fourteenth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Fourteenth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Devote the first portion of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Devote the second portion of the period to a silent reading test as given each week throughout the term.

Assignment.

None.

Fifteenth Week, First Day.

Procedure.

Collect the reports on home silent reading.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice porduction, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Fifteenth Week, Second Day.

Procedure.

Remind the students that the weekly silent reading report and the monthly exercising record are due at the next meeting of the class.

Devote the first portion of the period to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

Devote the second portion of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

None.

Fifteenth Week, Third Day.

Procedure.

Collect the reports of home silent reading.

Collect the records of home exercising.

During the first portion of the period give the Thorndike Scale, Alpha 2, Part II, for measuring the understanding of sentences. (Compare the results on these with the results at the beginning of the term.)

Devote the rest of the period to extempore speaking as scheduled. Criticise the speaking at the end of the period.

Assignment.

Announce the date and time of the final examination.

Give a final examination of two hours on the material covered in the assigned readings covering the theory of speaking, and the precepts propounded from time to time in the class.

Summary

Assignments are made covering conversational quality, choosing a subject and finding material, outlining, the principles of attention, the theory of persuasion, the use of emotion in speaking, and gesture.

At least three private appointments with each student are had.

The first two weeks are given to impromptu speaking for the purpose of getting acquainted with the emotional reactions of the students, and establishing a friendly atmosphere.

The third week is devoted to standard tests—(taking inventory).

A complete history of each student is secured.

The 4th and 5th, 10th and 11th, and 14th and 15th weeks are devoted to extempore speaking.

The 6th and 7th weeks are devoted to prepared reading from the printed page.

The 8th and 9th weeks are devoted to reading poetry at sight. Since the same selections are used throughout, although read by different students each time, there is a gradually increasing familiarity with the selections.

The 12th and 13th weeks are devoted to reading non-dramatic prose at sight.

A portion of two days each week is given over to exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and gesture.

A portion of one day each week is taken to give a silent reading drill and test.

Weekly reports on home silent reading are required.

Records of the amount of time given to exercising are kept by each student and handed in every four weeks.

An examination is given during the term to determine the things that require reiteration or strengthening.

A final written examination is given to determine the adequacy of each student's knowledge of the theory of speaking.

An individual examination is given to determine progress in the mechanics of relaxation, voice production, breathing, and gesture, and the opportunity taken to give each student a last bit of advice should the circumstances warrant it.

Library of
Southwestern College

PANTOMIME: ITS USE IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

ALMA M. BULLOWA
Hunter College High School, New York City

WHEN I asked a number of teachers of English what the greatest limitation of the first term students was, the answers were enlightening and suggestive; and sufficiently bore out my impression and confirmed my practice in the Oral English classroom. "The students do not think!" is but a crude way of saying that the students use words not as means to convey thought, but as mere words. This is indeed the quagmire out of which too few students, High School and College, alike, never emerge. The pitiful result of this emphasis upon words is sometimes painfully manifest on public platform, stage, and pulpit. In the old days when the preacher droned along and spoke words which were not inspired by the fire kindled by the thought-process, the beadle, waking up the sleeping offender with his pointed rod, collected also a tax in the leather pouch which was attached. Today, the offender is the preacher, and he is punished by the vacant pews.

When our pupils come to us from the elementary schools, it is lamentable that so many of them conceive words to be of importance of themselves. In a sense, though, this is a natural outcome of the period when it is essential for the pupils to learn to handle the tools. Words take on undue importance. The pupils are in the condition of the pianist whose technique is of greater importance than the interpretation of the musical composition. This is a stage in the development, to be succeeded by the true artist's understanding that finished technique can never do more than serve to convey more easily and pleasingly deep appreciation of the underlying idea and spirit of the musical conception. It is this habit of verbal-mindedness that must be broken before effective speaking or reading or studying in the High School can be looked for. Ask the students to read or memorize a poem of nature, and very few of them will dream of the lovely pictures which the poet conceived and which they too should enjoy above and beyond the mere words which serve to give it form, outline and coloring. Even the simple picture is not conceived with any vividness. A dramatic poem of the

simplest character, as "The Singing Lesson" by Jean Ingelow or MacDonald's "The Wind and The Moon" or "Pussy's Class" has been used frequently and until questioned particularly, the picture no more lived and moved than would the paints and paint-brushes in the artist's box make of themselves the picture. We must give the pupils the idea that the words are his tools, and that even as the artist mind of the poet has shaped it, his mind must produce the picture with such word-tools as have been selected for him. His mind must work, it must produce something; words, of themselves, are but passive tools properly selected, but waiting the mind of the speaker-creator to put them to use.

Speech is but one of the many languages which we may use to convey thought. That the pupil happens to employ words rather than gesture, facial expression, painting, sculpture, inarticulated cry, is as trifling a circumstance as that one goes to Boston by aeroplane, or automobile, rather than by train, or vessel. The point is that we get there. The distance of one mind to another is to be spanned. To use the most effective means to carry the thought-message is like choosing the best vessel to sail from port to port. But the cargo of thought—the idea, the picture, is of supreme moment. What is the cargo? If you have no cargo—if it is not actually and vividly there—the vessel, however good and seaworthy, cannot carry it. Have you a message? Even if the vessel is but a poorly constructed craft, the cargo has a chance of reaching the port for which it is intended. The ideal condition is that the cargo be there, the ship be properly and fittingly selected, and the captain well able to steer the vessel across the seas, so that the cargo will reach without mishap, its destined port. When the ship is not seaworthy the cargo must be abandoned or another craft selected. When the speech is inadequate to convey thought, speech must be abandoned, and recourse to gesture must be had. Thus if a foreigner fail to understand our question, we attempt "sign language."

This is a great step to take with our pupils; to let them realize that thought is of primary significance whatever be the conveyancer. Our next task is to introduce the pantomime of the simplest emotions. This is always done in incident form so that the mere emotion or emotion-reaction is not ipso-facto emphasized. This will avoid emphasis of emotion and will be the less likely to lead to emo-

tionalism. Suppose I had mislaid a book, and after searching in vain for it, and being realy discouraged, I come upon it unexpectedly. How would my pleasure reveal itself? How could you tell how pleased I was? Or, suppose you are a little girl of six, and you go home from school some day and find that mother has baked you a wonderful chocolate cake? Show me what you'ld do. Would words say it as well? How do you show that you are pleased with a birthday gift now? How many means do you use to convey the idea? How could you pantomime "Good Morning" or "Good-bye" to your friends on entering or leaving a room? Would it be more or less effective than your usual means of expressing the wish?

But the next step is even more interesting. Let us see how we can tell a story in pantomime. We begin with Little Miss Muffett, Simple Simon, Little Jack Horner, Little Boy Blue, or Old Mother Hubbard. First, only those characters are included which are mentioned in the rhyme. Then the scene is localized and other characters which might be related are included. The pupils themselves suggest these additions as they suggest the background. Sometimes very original versions are pieced together. For example, in "Little Miss Muffitt" there may be various types of mother and motherly reaction suggested, and this of course will influence Miss Muffett's career. The introduction of flies will make the action interesting when the curds and whey have been spilled. The following sketches briefly show one version actually suggested by first year pupils.

Scene I. Mrs. Muffett's kitchen. Mrs. Muffett is washing at the tub which is definitely located. There is a cabinet fairly high up on one wall and a window or door. Enter Miss Muffett who attracts her mother's attention and indicates that she wishes to enjoy the something good in the cupboard. Mother reluctantly indicates that she may get it for herself and also that she must go outside to eat it. The action is capable of infinite variety. The mother must not take her hand out of water to point outside without first shaking the water and suds off or drying her hands on her apron. Miss Muffett must get a stool to reach the cabinet where the curds and whey are kept before she goes out, and she must actually open and close the cabinet door.

Scene II. Miss Muffett seated upon the tuffet eating her curds and whey. Her method of holding the bowl and handling the spoon is always interesting. Her satisfaction must be shown. The spider approaches stealthily. Miss Muffett is petrified with fear, jumps up, and runs in to mother. The fate of the bowl is commented upon. Flies gather about and feast with the spider upon the remaining curds and whey.

Scene III. Miss Muffett's return to her mother, who hears the child's cry and has come to the window. The mother may be all tenderness and give her more curds and whey, or she may be more severe and take the child back to the scene of the crime after having wiped off the dress ruined by the spilled curds and whey.

Scene IV. Discovered, the mother or Little Miss Muffett clearing up the debris, the spider, flies in the distance or being chased away. In one case the mother killed the spider by stepping on it.

"Old Mother Hubbard" was worked out singularly well. It was explained that one Master Hubbard, son, unable to go to school because the said scoundrel, having torn his one pair of trousers was obliged to absent himself until his mother should have mended them. She had been obliged to go to the village to purchase thread and had warned her son to remain indoors.

Scene I. Tommy Hubbard rises from bed and dons his torn trousers, shirt, etc., seizes a fishing rod and exits with the dog at his heels.

Scene II. Tommy returns, with dog following. He is hungry, goes to cupboard and helps himself to meat, bread, cake, etc. Drops fishing-rod, kicks it aside and exits, slamming door on dog.

Scene III. Mrs. Hubbard returns, speaks to Tommy whom she believes to be in bed; removes her hat and shawl and goes to take up trousers. Then she discovers Tommy's absence. She decides to knit, but dog begs for food. She goes to the cupboard and finds that the food has gone. Then she vows vengeance on Tommy.

Scene IV. Tommy's return and Mrs. Hubbard's reaction.

Simple Simon is another very effective pantomime. A country fair is in progress. A pieman sells his wares. Several people stop to buy, and he makes change. A young country boy tries to steal a pie and is chastised, and the pies upset. Simple Simon comes along just as the pieman is recovering his pies. The pieman is doubtful of one who wishes to buy such ruined pastry and asks for the money. Simon searches in vain and the pieman is unsympathetic, indicating that he believes Simon to be related to the knave who upset his pies. The characters at the fair, both buyers and sellers, are capable of variety and afford interesting material for study.

Thus the simple stories are told without words and the idea is conveyed through the strength of the thought surging through the whole body into action channels. This is not only using a natural expression medium for the earliest period of adolescence for the pupils enjoy the "acting" or "thought-acting" as we prefer to call it; but also it serves to create a sense of freedom in expression that should be an ideal in every classroom.

The next step is the more complex folk story. As a rule we tell the story of "The Three Bears" or "Red Riding Hood" simply but vividly adding human touches of our own with perhaps a suggestion as to the appropriate pantomime. Then there is a short class discussion as to the number of scenes; simple setting; localization of furniture, etc. Characters volunteer. The following outline will adequately suggest the method.

The Three Bears.

Episode I.

Scene I. The home of Mrs. Goldylocks. She is engaged in sewing. Goldylocks is outside in the garden. The mother leans out of the window to warn Goldylocks not to go beyond the garden walls.

Scene II. Goldylocks is playing in the garden, when a butterfly attracts her attention and she gives chase.

Scene III. Goldylocks has followed the butterfly into the wood, lost sight of it, and then discovers that she has wandered far; in fact, has lost her way. She sits down to cry. She hears a bird sing. She understands that it sings "Follow me." She follows its song and soon sees a little house at the

door of which she knocks, first fearfully and then more impatiently. She receives no answer and finally turns the knob of the door and goes in.

Scene IV. The home of the Bears. She finds the bowls on the table, and determines to taste the porridge. She tries each bowl with appropriate reaction. She then determines to sit down and rest; she tries each of the three easy chairs with appropriate reaction to them. When the little chair breaks under her, she is at a loss to know what to do. She is tired, yawns and then unexpectedly notices a stairway which she decides may lead her to a bedroom.

Scene V. The bedroom of the Bear family. Goldylocks finds three beds and tries each; when she tries the little bed she puts her head on her arm and falls asleep.

Episode 2.

Scene I. The bears return, find the door ajar, and are surprised. Father Bear suggests that Mother has been careless. Mother Bear is sure that she closed the door. They go to the table and are about to eat when Father Bear notices that a spoon has ben left in his porridge. He holds it up and charges Mother Bear with her carelessness. She denies that she left the spoon in the bowl, and turning to her own bowl, finds a spoon in hers also. This is sufficiently strange, but by this time Baby Bear is discovered to be crying because his porridge has disappeared. Father and Mother are astonished. Mother comforts Baby and cools some of her porridge for him. Then Father Bear decides to read his morning paper and is about to sit in his chair when he notices that the tidy at the back of the chair has been displaced. He again declares that there has been someone in the house. Mother Bear sees that the cushions in her chair have been disturbed, and Baby Bear who has been playing comes to sit in his chair and finds it broken. Mother takes Baby on her lap and comforts him. Baby Bear falls asleep and Mother Bear attracts the attention of Father Bear and all start to go upstairs.

Scene II. In the bedroom. Father Bear takes off his coat and goes over to his bed, discovers pillows, etc., disarranged, and again complains that Mother Bear is growing careless.

Mother Bear rearranges the bed clothes for her lord and master, turns to her own bed, finds it disarranged, also, and is much distressed. Baby Bear looks toward his bed and discovers little Goldylocks there asleep. He is filled with astonishment and begins to dance with joy. At this point Father and Mother Bear are lost in wonder, Goldylocks awakes and stimulated by her fright and the strange surroundings, she dashes out of the door and down the stairs.

Scene III. (To satisfy the desire for a happy ending.) The house of Goldylocks. Goldylocks rushes in to promise her mother never to go away again and to tell her of her adventure.

The pupils are so alert to inconsistencies that as audience they object when the characters forget details, which though not actually present, must be kept in mind. When Master Hubbard drops his fishing rod Mrs. Hubbard may not be permitted to walk on it. Father Bear may not complain that "Someone has been eating my porridge" until he has discovered it!

Thus a whole story has been told in language other than words —and the body has to come into its own, since movement, gesture, facial expression have been restored to something which bears the semblance of an expression-art. We are now ready to show how. by combining both the gesture which arises from the real thought-experience, and the appropriate verbal-expression, one has the ideal conveyancer.

The story of Cinderella or Hansel and Gretel is acted out with words. Sincerity is insisted upon. The pupils see that scenery is entirely superfluous. Later, and in correlation with work of the English Department, comes the pantomime of the Greek myths. The story of Pandora, a combination of Longfellow's "Masque of Pandora," and the Hawthorne and Guerber versions, is told. The scenes are plotted and the characters are chosen, following the procedure already outlined. Other myths which we use are "Echo and Narcissus," "Cupid and Psyche," "Apollo and Daphne," "Philemon and Baucus" and "Minerva and Arachne."

Still later the first act of Maeterlinck's "Blue Bird" is used. Here, as before, the thought element is made of primary importance, manifesting itself in the pantomimic action first, and second-

arily in the words spoken. At any time, at any place in the progress of the act the pupils may be asked to stop, should they be using Maeterlinck's words, and continue in pantomime alone, or vice versa.

Thus the pupils not only gain in power of real critical judgment with the only real standard of sincerity as their criterion, but also they learn to bring to the theatre that ideal relation of audience to actor which ought to make our drama not only more sincere, but also more representative of the lives of the American people.

To make thought rather than verbal expression of primary significance, to emphasize the necessity of vital thinking in the conveying of a message from one mind to another,—to give the body freedom, and by an insistence upon this body-freedom, to develop confidence, is the aim of this work in pantomime. The diffidence established through this pantomimic exercise may delay or divert that stream of self-consciousness which is so disastrous later on. The very fact that students are truly thinking in terms of life outside themselves has a tendency to dissipate that ego-centricity which characterizes the age. The opportunity afforded of doing something which girls of early adolescence like to do dissipates often that formal atmosphere which is so disastrous to classroom activity and which so often saps the life of educational development.

A greater ability to appreciate the necessity for understanding the thought which words convey will result in better work in all school subjects, physics, history, and even mathematics. Less work which should be understood will be memorized, and school studies will have a more real value.

DIALECTIC—A NEGLECTED METHOD OF ARGUMENT

EVERETT LEE HUNT
Cornell University

IT IS a commonplace among lawyers that skill in cross-examination has more to do with winning a case than the ability to make a speech. As the extension of education increases the intelligence of juries this becomes even more true. It is also a commonplace of intercollegiate debating that skill in rebuttal has more to do with winning a debate than the ability to deliver a polished oration. But curiously enough, while cross-examination and refutation are admittedly of supreme importance in all argumentative contests, we have no methods of training for them comparable to our training in continuous discourse. The ancient schools of Greece and the mediaeval universities supplied this want by their training in dialectic. The process of cross-examination is the process of dialectic applied in the courtroom or investigating committee. But because we now use cross-examination to bring out concrete facts, and the dialectic of the schoolmen was employed in metaphysical abstractions, we overlook the identity of the method. In teaching argumentation it is well to be concrete, but it is also well to have the student realize that the process of argumentation is the same process whether you are trying to win a case in court, to conduct a political campaign, to defend a religion, to found a metaphysical system, to establish a working hypothesis in scientific research, or to predict the results of prohibition. A thorough training in dialectic would make clear the unity of the process in the variety of material. To guard against misunderstanding that might arise from the various meanings which have attached themselves to the term dialectic, it may be stated that any process of argumentation conducted by question and answer rather than by continuous discourse is here regarded as a dialectic process. It will thus be clear that the dialectic process includes cross-examination. While an understanding of the place of dialectic in ancient and mediaeval education will add greatly to our conception of its present possibilities, it may be well to discard tradition for the moment, and discuss it from a modern standpoint, using the term cross-examination instead of dialectic, that it may seem more concrete.

The process of cross-examination may be viewed as an argument in which the premises are supplied by one party, and the conclusions by the other. It is as if two men were building a tower; one man furnishing the stones, the other doing the building. When there is harmony, the stones furnished will be of the desired shape and size, fitted to the plan of the builder. In this case the process is analogous to direct examination. The questioner has reason for expecting his respondent to supply the desired premises in his answers; the respondent has little fear that unexpected and disconcerting conclusions will be drawn. In cross-examination, however, there is a contest. The witness, to revert to the analogy, believes his stones adapted to a tower of certain size and shape. The cross-examiner, or builder, desires a different structure. He must, therefore, by the order in which he obtains and places his stones, and by the occasional shattering and reshaping of them, build as best he may with the stones that are given him.

Were the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, sought by both parties in the case, the difference between direct and cross-examination might not be so marked. But even if no opposition of interests were present and there were no dispute about the facts, different conclusions would suggest themselves, and an accurate analysis of the case would demand some method of separating evidence from inferences. Cross-examination provides a system whereby a conclusion can be built up from the contentions of opponents. Each party is checked by the other.

This principle is fundamental for the solution of all disputed problems. Both premises and inferences of each side must at all times be subject to the scrutiny of the opposition. Continuous, uninterrupted discourse is not favorable to this. A statement of an opponent's position is often a straw man. Common ground is not achieved in the beginning, and the argument makes it less and less possible. The beginning of a debate may find opponents not far apart, and the truth half way between. But the heat of combat drives them farther from each other and from truth. Such a debate is like a naval battle—if the imagination may be used freely—in which the recoil from each broadside seems to move the ships farther and farther apart. The combat is ended, not by the victory of either party, nor by any armistice or treaty of peace, but because the ships have drifted completely out of range. The process of question and

answer, however, acts as the grappling hooks of John Paul Jones. The impossibility of going further in your conclusions than the premises of the opponent warrant, keeps the combat at close quarters. You may not go far together, but certainly you do not get far apart. The debate of continuous discourse is compelling only in so far as its reasoning progresses from premises agreed upon by both.

It is a commonplace of public speaking texts that much modern speaking is done before small assemblages, and that here speaking must be more conversational. The "conversational mode" in speaking implies that the speech is to be conceived *as if* it were a dialogue. Why not recognize that an increasing amount of public speaking *is* dialogue. Secretary Baker before the Senatorial investigating committee read a speech in which he presented his own premises and his own conclusions without interruption. Then for many hours he answered questions. His cross-examination was as truly public speaking as his continuous discourse, and would be studied in preference to the speech by one who wished to get at the results of the investigation.

We hardly walk down the street with a friend without cross-examining him. Our friend makes a general observation. If we counter with an opposing one, equally general, we get nowhere. But perhaps we think of a specific instance which would prove an exception to his generalization. Instead of arguing with him we ask a question about this particular example. He sees that his statement is too broad and qualifies it. We have not only gained a victory, if we are interested in that; we have made some progress in thinking together, which is vastly more important.

These well known uses of the process may suggest its possibilities as a class-room method. A description of the proceeding as actually employed will probably be more illuminating than further theory.

Students conducting the examination choose their subjects and prepare about as in debating. One student is designated as questioner and one as respondent. They occupy chairs in front of the class. The questioner must put all questions in such a form that they may be answered by yes or no, with possibly a minimum of qualification. Thus the respondent may not be asked for a definition or a theory, or be requested to volunteer any opinion whatsoever. The questioner must state all such parts of the argument and ask for agreement. The limitations of the class hour make it im-

possible to carry an examination to great lengths. The questioner is usually allowed about ten minutes in which to establish a point from the admissions of a respondent. At the end of this time the process is reversed and the respondent becomes questioner. Great variations in ability may be observed as a student passes from questioner to respondent. In the short time available few conclusions will be established. The justification of the process must be sought elsewhere.

The rules of the game are observed with varying strictness. Keen-witted boys will often proceed rapidly and keep strictly to question and answer. Some questioners will make speeches and then make questions of them by a glaring "Isn't this so?" Oftentimes respondents will refuse to make admissions if the case seems to be going against them, or they will introduce so many qualifications in their replies that the process becomes tedious. All possible variations of intelligence and temperament are shown most clearly. Every group will have its sophists and its bullies, but an instructor will often be amazed to see how quickly group sentiment can make itself felt in favor of serious and honest procedure.

Several variations are quite practicable. The dialogue may be preceded by a short continuous statement of the position of both parties. This saves time, and is particularly valuable where a conclusion is desired within the class period. Oftentimes, however, the most valuable part of the process is the skill developed in the attempts to get the problem fairly stated, and the fundamental definitions agreed upon. Again, one or both participants may make brief speeches at the end of the questioning, summarizing the argument, as a lawyer argues his case with the jury after the witnesses have been examined. Or the process may be used to advantage in connection with debate. After the constructive speeches have been given, a period of cross-examination may take the place of rebuttal; or it will often be found that students are more proficient in rebuttal if they have cross-examined each other before the debate. Every group of inter-collegiate debaters spends hours in general discussion, and it is a valuable part of the training. But it is usually formless and uncontrolled. It is conducted by association rather than by logical consequences. A series of cross-examinations is often a valuable preparation for the constructive argument as well as for the rebuttal.

While little specific logical theory is necessary for the conduct of

cross-examination, almost every dialogue will exemplify any logical distinction the instructor may care to emphasize. An elaborate set of directions may be given, but experience seems to show that, as in swimming, the chief requirement is to jump in.

A familiarity with the literature of the subject is desirable. The Platonic dialogues, which have made Socrates the great ideal of cross-examiners for all ages, are, of course, the classic source. The Alcibiades (I) is a dialogue which involves no metaphysics, exemplifies the method excellently, and is in itself worthy of a place upon any list of general reading for liberal arts students. G. Lowes Dickenson's *Justice and Liberty, The Meaning of Good,* and *A Modern Symposium* might be cited as modern examples of the dialectic discussion. They are a bit discursive, however, to serve as examples of logical method. Innumerable investigations and court-room cross-examinations are available. An industrious compiler might make them more so.

A form of written exercise that may profitably be employed is the construction of an argumentative brief from a series of questions and answers, or to reverse the process and construct a dialogue from a brief. It is an interesting and taxing logical process. In the questions we usually have a series of particulars leading to a general conclusion. In the brief we must reverse the process and state our general conclusion supported by particulars. This illustrates a significant difference between the methods of investigation and presentation. These written exercises may be used in preparation for oral work. Where an argument has been briefed, the student finds that the subordinate portions of the brief suggest the questions to be asked first. Here fertility of illustration is called for. Perhaps the subpoint in the brief will not be admitted by the opponent. An ingenious student will invent an analogous case of sufficient plausibility to obtain the desired reply. The whole process calls for readiness of illustration with strict relevancy. Here both industry in mastering a question and ingenuity and fertility of mind may be rewarded. The clever "bluffer" is revealed by the questions of his opponent, while the limitations of mere studiousness are self-evident.

These qualities of mind impress themselves upon students because of the reality of the process. A class will listen with greater interest to a cross-examination than to a debate. It will follow the argument more closely; it will appreciate a clever thrust more keen-

ly; it will busy itself in formulating possible questions, as a bystander in a chess game will speculate upon the next move.

As to the questions used, a somewhat wider range is permissable than in debate. Ordinarily we do not debate questions where no conclusion is possible. We should not, for instance, hold an intercollegiate debate upon the prospects of a successful administration under Mr. Harding. Nor should we debate the comparative qualifications of a business man and a scholar for a university presidency, or the possibilities of Democracy, or the highest good. Yet we discuss these things. We grow in thinking and talking about them. We may employ the logical processes of cross-examination is such questions, or we may use them in problems as definite as guilt of X, or the reliability of the intelligence test. It is a question of mental maturity and capacity. The process by its very nature forces us into definitions. Hazy notions are often cleared up as a saturated solution is cleared by the addition of the proper chemical. We may follow the demonstrative reasoning of the exact sciences, where we draw upon both observation and experiment; we may follow the formalistic procedure of the court room, where practical justice necessitates an immediate decision; or we may follow the practice of general argumentation in the realm of the probabilities that make up our daily living. Each type of argument is more significant when seen in the light of another.

Thus far the process of cross-examination as a part of argumentative training has been discussed with no appeal to precedent or authority. It seems to justify itself by its results. If it were not a practice as old as formal education itself, it would deserve introduction as a new movement. But the antiquity and extent of the practice make its history significant for all students of argumentation. In the history of thought the process has been exalted as the whole of education; it has been contemned as the emptiest of pursuits. Its possibilities and limitations may be judged more accurately in the light of the past.

II.

Aristotle begins his Rhetoric by declaring it to be a counterpart of dialectic. Rhetoric continuously, though with varying emphasis, has been a part of our educational system. But dialectic, to which Aristotle referred for the purpose of throwing light on rhetoric, has

so vanished from our formal education that the word has now only a historic meaning and interest. Perhaps we can best understand the place of dialectic by comparing it with two other great desciplines which we owe to Aristotle, logic and rhetoric. Logic, rhetoric, and dialectic form the organon of thought and expression for the ancient world. Aristotle in his Prior and Posterior Analytics formulated what seemed to him to be the laws of thought for scientific procedure. With that as a basis he reduced to logical method the process of dialectic argument, of which the Greeks were so fond. The Topics is the book in which he analyzes and gives rules for the conduct of dialectic. The same thing is done for the art of persuading multitudes in the Rhetoric. It is obvious to us that the laws of thought are the same whether employed in scientific investigation, in cross-examination, or in public address; but Aristotle presented the methods of these three activities in separate works. To be sure many similarities and repetitions exist, but he seems to have regarded them as diverse. We may say, then, that Aristotle, observing scientific thought, systematized it and gave us logic; observing argumentation conducted by question and answer, and systematizing it, he gave us dialectic; observing and systematizing the art of persuading crowds, he gave us rhetoric. Perhaps a brief contrast will make more clear their differences.

Scientific procedure starts with universal and necessary principles and proceeds by deductive or inductive reasoning to universal and necessary conclusions. Both dialectic and rhetoric, however, take as their premises current popular opinions, or perhaps opinions of dissenters. Any assertion in the realm of the probable will serve. The fundamental principles of a science cannot be proved within the bounds of that science. They are therefore assumed. The only way of questioning them is in dialectic debate. A few of these principles as axioms are common to all or to several sciences. But by far the larger part of the principles employed are special to the science concerned. As against this, rhetoric and dialectic are not limited to the propositions of any particular field. They may regard the ultimate assumptions of any science as mere probabilities and discuss them as such. In dialectic the number of special propositions, corresponding to scientific laws peculiar to one field, is small. On the other hand, the number of general propositions called topics, (corresponding to the comparatively few axioms of science) is large. In science,

again, we do not properly have a debatable matter, for there should be but one side to a scientific question, and that represented not by an advocate, but by a truth-seeker. Dialectic and rhetoric can arrive as easily at one side of the question as at another. They may employ any material conceded by an opponent. They may be indifferent to the truth of a conclusion if the form and method have been accurately followed.

A further contrast between rhetoric and dialectic may be observed. Dialectic is conducted by two speakers with a small audience of interested listeners who see that the argument is conducted fairly. Rhetoric involves one speaker and an audience. This accounts for the difference in the reasoning process employed. The large audience will not have the patience or the intelligence to proceed with exact logic. In place of the syllogism we have the enthymeme. In place of the inductive reasoning of science or dialectic, we proceed by example. Example is easier to attend to and is more persuasive, though not logically conclusive. In general it may be said that rhetoric has given us the method of argumentation for the market place and public assembly, while dialectic has been the method of the closet, the method of speculative thinkers. Rhetorical training was sought by men of active pursuits and ambition, either as a means to a public career, or for self-defense in the courts. Dialectic argumentation presented opportunities to men of speculative turn, who were deficient in voice or boldness, or who desired to do their thinking apart from the political or forensic strife of the time.

The value of dialectic, according to Aristotle, has been thus stated by Grote: "First, the debate is valuable and stimulating as an intellectual exercise; and if a methodized procedure be laid down, both parties will be able to conduct it more easily as well as more efficaciously. Secondly, it is useful for our intercourse with the multitude, for the procedure directs us to note and remember the opinions of the multitude; we shall converse with them out of their own opinions, which we may thus be able beneficially to modify. Thirdly, dialectic debate has a useful though indirect bearing upon the processes of science and philosophy. It accustoms us to study both sides of every question. Also it opens up a new road to the scrutiny of the first *principia* of each separate science. Dialectic, carrying investigation everywhere, suggests many points of importance in regard to these *principia*."

While we credit Aristotle with setting forth the theory and precepts of dialectic, we find the finest dialectic in the dialogue of Plato. Aristotle could never have formulated his rules had he not been thoroughly familiar with the dialectic argumentation of the Academy, and no student can comprehend the significance of dialectic who is not familiar with the Socratic dialogues, so wonderfully given us by Plato. Of Athenian dialectic we may say that Zeno invented it; Plato brought it to perfection; and Aristotle analyzed and systematized it. There was no great dialectic after that which Aristotle dissected, nor was there any great oratory after Aristotle's Rhetoric.

In Roman education, dialectic was absorbed in rhetoric. When education passed into the hands of Christian institutions, dialectic became one of the Seven Liberal Arts. Throughout this entire period dialectic grew in educational importance as its utility for defending Christian doctrines became more and more manifest. As dialectic had served oratory in Greece and Rome, it now served theology.

Next to the sophists, the dialecticians of the Middle Ages are probably the most berated figures in the history of thought. Perhaps the dialecticians are even more abused than the sophists. We do credit the sophists with cleverness and practicality, we can see some human motive even in the worst of their alleged misuse of wits. But the scholastics we regard as inhuman beings of indescribable solemnity, holding long disputations about questions that can not possibly matter. Yet from them we might learn much in the methods of argumentation. We might envy the schoolmen their keenness and power of abstract thought. With a little understanding of the period we might even feel touches of kinship and sympathy.

We are accustomed to think of freedom of discussion as a fruit of the victory of science in its warfare with theology. But in the dialectic attack on Acquinas and the Thomistic philosophy we see reason beginning to emerge triumphant in its struggle with authority. Duns Scotus and Occam virtually established the freedom of philosophy from theological domination. After this the scholastic method fell into decadence, but not until the intellect, unsupported by science and its achievements (the significance of Roger Bacon was not appreciated for several centuries after his death) had reasoned its way to a large measure of freedom.

The field of dialectic offered the one opportunity for the schoolman of the twelfth century to enjoy something of the pleasure of

knowledge for its own sake. The study of classical literature was cultivated at times and places throughout the entire mediaeval period, but again and again denunciations of profane literature came from the clergy. Even those who loved it suffered from uneasy consciences. Jerome dreamed of his exclusion from Heaven because of too great delight in classic reading. In dialectic, however, no sense of guilt weighed down the student as in the case of the Monk who loved his Vergil. The syllogism was neither Christian nor pagan; the process of right reasoning was the same for all men. But the harmless neutrality of logical reasoning was not so harmless as it seemed. Thinking is always dangerous. The same mind could not concentrate upon logic and then upon theology without being tempted to apply one to the other. The result we all know.

In addition to contributing to intellectual freedom the mediaeval dialectic furnished the method for education. With all our modern range of study and our pedagogical methods, which enable a student to learn a lesson before he knows it, it is doubtful if any of the intellectual activities of our class rooms project themselves as fully into the student life as did the mediaeval disputations.

The burden of Bacon's charge against the learning of the preceding ages was that it was a logic of argument and not a logic of observation and experiment. But although he did condemn sophist and philosopher alike among the Greeks because they were "professorial, and reduced every subject to controversy, establishing certain sects and dogmas of philosophy, so that their doctrines were nearly the talk of idle old men to ignorant youths," still he does admit that there is a field of usefulness, even for such unscientific debate. * * * "For we deny not that the received system of philosophy, and others of a similar nature, encourage discussion, embellish harangues, and are of service in the duties of the professor, and in the affairs of civil life. Nay, we openly express and declare that the philosophy we offer will not be very useful in such respects."

No one who knows the weaknesses of the academic mind can fail to sympathize with Bacon in his feeling that the embellishment of professorial harangues was not a vitally important matter. And his battle for science and the scientific method has been fought and won. But it must be admitted that even yet we live and act largely in the realm of opinion, where probability is our only guide. We think we have a political science, but we are still able to appreciate the

humor of Leibniz when he proved by the geometrical method in sixty propositions that Count Palatine of Neuburg must be chosen King of the Poles. The experimental method does not solve the controversy over the League of Nations, nor tell us how to treat our conscientious objectors. We do not permit an expert to dictate our vote or control our morals. These things we decide by discussion, if not with our neighbors, by a conflict of opinion within our own minds. When science and the scientific method can silence discussion by giving us a really authoritative answer, we are glad. So much more of chaos has become cosmos. So much more of our energy can be concentrated upon problems remaining. And we will welcome the scientific method in every problem. Where we can wait for its decision we will wait. But where we must act, and act immediately, a wide knowledge of the probabilities and a trained faculty of deducing consequences give us our only hope.

John Stuart Mill, who formulated the canons of induction and urged the application of scientific methods to the field of moral conduct, cannot be accused of an over-fondness for Aristotelian logic. Yet he deplored the abandonment of the dialectic method. "I should like to see the teachers of mankind endeavoring to provide a substitute for it: some contrivance for making the difficulties as present to the learner's consciousness as if they were pressed upon him by a dissentient champion eager for his conversion. But instead of seeking contrivances for this purpose, they have lost those they formerly had. The Socratic dialogues, so magnificently exemplified in the dialogues of Plato, were a contrivance of this description. * * * The school disputations of the middle ages had a similar object. * * * The modern mind owes far more to both than it is generally willing to admit. It is the fashion of the present time to disparage negative logic—that which points out weaknesses in theory or errors in practice, without establishing positive truths. Such negative criticism would indeed be poor enough as an ultimate result, but as a means to attaining any positive knowledge or conviction worthy the name it cannot be valued too highly; and until people are again trained systematically to it, there will be few great thinkers, and a low general average of the intellect in any but the mathematical and physical departments of speculation."

Such systematic training in negative criticism can doubtless be obtained in many ways, but the inclusion of dialectic within the

courses in argumentation and debate would increase their contribution to education.

Bibliography

Plato's Dialogues. Jowett translation.
Lutoslawski. Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic. London. 1897.
Campbell. General introduction to his edition of The Sophist and Statesman. Oxford. 1849.
Grote. Aristotle. London. 1872.
Grote. Plato. London. 1888.
Poste. Translation of Sophistici Elenchi. London. 1886.
Poste. Translation of the Posterior Analytics. Oxford. 1850.
Cope. Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric. London. 1886.
Welldon. Translation to Aristotle's Rhetoric.
Williston. Article on Logic, Monroe's Encyclopaedia of Education.
Abelson. The Seven Liberty Arts. New York. 1906.
Paetow. The Arts Course at Mediaeval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric. Urbana. 1910.
Parker. The Seven Liberal Arts. English Historical Review. V. pp. 417-461.
Taylor. The Mediaeval Mind. London. 1911.
Taylor. The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages. New York. 1901.
Rashdall. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. Oxford. 1895.
Mullinger. The University of Cambridge from Earliest Times to 1535. Cambridge. 1873.
Compayre. Abelard and the Origin and Early History of Universities. New York. 1893.
Bacon. Novum Organum.
Mill, J. S. On Liberty.

A FOOTNOTE IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSUASION

CHAS. F. LINDSLEY
University of Minnesota

IN the summer of 1863 Henry Ward Beecher went to England to seek relief from his arduous labor in this country and to recruit strength for his winter's work. He went as a private citizen seeking health and quiet; but the small group of Englishmen who sympathized with the northern states in their war against the southern Confederacy fell upon him and importuned his aid. "Mr. Beecher, we have been counted as the off-scouring because we have taken up the part of the North. We have sacrificed ourselves in your behalf, and now if you go home and show us no favor or strength they will overwhelm us. They will say, 'Even your friends in America despise you,' and we shall be nowhere, and we think it is rather a hard return." The committee informed him of a great plan to hold public meetings during all that autumn and early winter among the laboring masses to change popular feeling in order that Parliament might be publicly supported in declaring for the southern Confederacy. "If you lecture for us you can head off this whole movement," he was told. Mr. Beecher finally yielded to the urgent demands of his English friends, and consented to make addresses at Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and London. The record of these speeches is the story of one of the most stubborn oratorical battles and greatest personal triumphs recorded in the history of platform eloquence. It is my purpose in this article to present an analysis of these addresses from the viewpoint of Persuasion.

In order to appreciate fully Mr. Beecher's difficult problem in addressing British audiences in the year 1863, and to understand clearly the temper of public opinion in England at that period, it is helpful to know something of the political and diplomatic background of our Civil War as well as the effect this war had upon Great Britain. "The feeling in England during our American Civil War was largely in favor of the cause of the Confederate States."[1] "The error that lay at the root of our English miscon-

[1] Autobiography and Memoirs, The Duke of Argyll, Vol. II., p. 169.

ception of the American struggle is now clear. We applied ordinary political maxims to what was not an ordinary political contest, but a social revolution. Without scrutiny of the cardinal realities beneath, we discussed it like some superficial conflict in an old world about boundaries, successions, territorial partitions, dynastic preponderance."[2] A more concrete cause of English ill feeling was the fact that the northern blockade of southern ports cut off the supply of raw cotton on which Lancashire depended. "This helped to excite a strong feeling in England in favor of the recognition of the independence of the southern states."[3] The Cabinet wavered in their opinion as to the advisability of maintaining strict neutrality. "The leading political figure in England at the time was Lord Palmerston, the prime minister, well known, to use a word not then coined, as a jingo. He was distinctly favorable to the South and was not loath to interfere. His foreign secretary, Lord John Russel, was less decided in his sympathies and less inclined to action. Both recognized the necessity of waiting upon public opinion. This force * * * seemed at first overwhelmingly pro-southern * * * 'The Times,' at the zenith of its prestige, if not of its power, was outspoken, and it represented the opinion of the governing classes. The Earl of Malmesbury wrote, May 23, 1862: 'There is a rumor that the Confederates have been defeated and Beauregard taken prisoner, which everybody regrets. The feeling for the South is very strong in society' * * * There was an almost universal feeling in England that the South could not be subdued. Edward A. Freeman, the historian, brought out in 1863, "A History of Federal Government from the Foundations of the Achaian League to the Disruption of the United States."[4] Then came the Trent affair. Captain Wilkes of the San Jacinto stopped an English mail packet on her way from Havana to the Danish island of St. Thomas, a neutral port, and took off Mason and Slidell, southern envoys to France and England. Acting on his own authority, Wilkes took Mason and Slidell to Fortress Monroe. "A storm of enthusiastic approval swept northern United States. A storm of indignation of equal intensity swept England. * * * Congress voted unanimously to thank Captain Wilkes for his brave, adroit, and patriotic conduct in the arrest and detention of the traitors, James M. Mason

[2] Life of Gladstone, John Morley, Vol. II., p. 70.
[3] The Duke of Argyll. Ibid.
[4] American Diplomacy, Carl Russell Fisk. Pp. 313-314.

and John Slidell. The President was requested to present Captain Wilkes a gold medal with suitable emblems and devices in testimony of the high sense entertained by Congress of his good conduct."[5] England answered by despatching troops to Canada, and Lord Lyon, ambassador to this country, was told: "If at the end of that time (seven days) no answer is given except that of a compliance with the demands of her Majesty's Government, your Lordship is instructed to leave Washington, with all the members of your legation, bringing with you the archives of the legation, and to repair immediately to London."[6] As Mr. Adams remarks, "the insanity passed away almost as suddenly as it had asserted itself;" but the event did not create a more friendly feeling on either side of the water. Another cause of ill feeling between England and the North was occasioned by the further fact that the British government seemed to favor the South in the matter of securing armed cruisers from English ship builders. Early in the war a vessel known as the "Oreto" was equipped at Liverpool, sailed for the Bahamas, was seized at Nassau, released after full investigation, then ran the blockade, was armed at Mobile and became the "Florida." Late in June, 1862, Lord Russell's attention was called to a vessel launched at Messrs. Laird's yard at Birkenhead which was fitting out for the especial and manifest object of carrying on hostilities at sea. The government was dilatory in carrying on an investigation and the suspected vessel escaped and began her destructive career as the "Alabama." The "Alabama" claims were long a matter of controversy. An acquaintance with these facts helps one to understand that Englishmen were not willing to lend an attentive ear to a champion of the southern cause.

When Mr. Beecher stepped from the train at Manchester, he found the streets placarded with blood-red letters:

WHO IS
HENRY WARD BEECHER?

He is the man who said the best blood of England must be shed to atone for the Trent affair.

He is the man who advocates a War of Extermination with the South,—says it is incapable of "re-generation," but proposes to re-people it from the North by "generation."

[5] American Historical Review, Vol. XVII., "The Trent Affair." C. F. Adams.
[6] Life of Lord John Russell, Spencer Walpole. Vol. II., p. 346.

> He is the friend of that inhuman monster, General BUTLER. He is the friend of that so-called Gospel Preacher, CHEEVER, who said in one of his sermons—"Fight against the South till Hell Freezes, and then continue the battle on the ice."
>
> He is the friend and supporter of a most debased female, who uttered at a public meeting in America the most indecent and cruel language that ever polluted female lips.
>
> MEN OF MANCHESTER, ENGLISHMEN!
>
> What reception can you give this wretch, save unmitigated disgust and contempt? His impudence in coming here is only equalled by his cruelty and impiety. Should he, however, venture to appear, it behooves all right-minded men to render as futile as the first this second attempt to get up a public demonstration in favor of the North, which is now waging war against the South with a vindictive and revengeful cruelty unparalleled in the history of any Christian land.

Such posters were used in every city in which he spoke. In Liverpool, posters 20 x 30 inches called upon the independent and industrial classes of that city to attend the lecture and "show by your hearts and hands that the industrial classes in this town are opposed to the bloody War which Abraham Lincoln is waging against his brothers in the South, and the dastardly means he is resorting to in employing such tools as Henry Ward Beecher, a minister of the Gospel." It was against audiences stimulated by such inflammatory appeals that Beecher rose to speak. Mobs roared and armed men gathered to do him violence; but he broke successively the spirit of each mob that faced him and forced them to hear his argument in behalf of Liberty and Union. I have not space in this article to measure these orations by all the standards or criteriae considered in chapters on "Persuasion and Influencing Conduct," and shall limit this analysis as follows: first, I wish to speak briefly of the general plan of Mr. Beecher's speeches and show how, broadly considered, the speaker tried to adapt himself to the "general disposition," the special interests, peculiarities, and susceptibilities of the audiences he met; second, I shall sketch briefly the particular method of approach (or method of "preliminary tuning" to use a phrase from Professor Woolbert) to each audience; and finally I

desire to present a topical outline of each speech to the Manchester, Glasgow, and Liverpool speeches and indicate how the orator gave acceptance value to each of his propositions.

Mr. Beecher's central purpose was "to enlist against this flagitious wickedness (slavery), and the great civil war which it has kindled, the judgment, conscience, and interests of the British." The specific proposition advanced in each case was: "Slavery was the cause, the only cause, the whole cause of this gigantic and cruel war." He drew sharply the issue of slavery versus freedom, and attempted to show that sympathy for the South was sympathy with "an audacious attempt to build up a slave empire pure and simple." By choosing this as the central theme of his addresses he was able to lift his appeal to the plane of morality and at the same time fit himself to the acting nature of his audiences by arousing their inherent respect for free institutions, individual rights, and law; for Englishmen had been fighting their way for centuries against the darkness of political corruption and tyrannical control to the light of a more popular representative government. "So rooted is this English people in the faith of liberty, that it were an utterly hopeless task for any minion or sympathizer of the South to sway the popular sympathy of England, if this English people believed that this was none other than a conflict between liberty and slavery," he declared in opening his argument at Manchester; and this established his general plan for this whole course of lectures.

The orator's method of securing contact with each of his special audiences revealed a rare subtlety in adaptation. At Manchester his purpose was to present a history of the external political movement in the United States for the first half of the nineteenth century to illustrate that the war was only an overt and warlike form of a contest between liberty and slavery that had been going on for half a century; and this is the central theme of his recorded speech. But in his own account of the speech Beecher declared that he threw away his notes on this occasion and entered on a discussion of the value of freedom as opposed to slavery in the manufacturing interest, arguing that freedom everywhere increases a man's necessities, and what he needs he buys, and that it was therefore to the interest of the manufacturing community to stand by the side of labor thruout the country.[7] The transition to this second method

[7] Patriotic Addresses. "Account of the English Speeches." P. 643.

of argument was made necessary by the hostile and uncompromising attitude of the audience. Had his hearers been calm, interested, even neutral they would have accepted a rational exposition of the background of the slavery movement and have been convinced; but Beecher saw at once that he would have to use a more vital method of stimulation and turned to a discussion of the relation of slavery to the commercial and manufacturing interests of the city. Manchester's mills were idle, men were out of work, production was stagnated: cotton and raw materials were needed, and a return to prosperous trade relations. Beecher recognized these facts and adapted his speech to meet the situation. At Glasgow Beecher faced another group whose industrial life had been injured by the war, and he was again forced to demonstrate the fallacy of slave labor, and prove that "the Southern cause is the natural enemy of free labor all over the world." He attempted to establish the argument that labor all over the world was united in interest and that slavery had made labor disreputable. The Edinburgh speech was "smooth sailing." "There was a different audience there; there was an educated and moral element in it." To these elements Beecher adapted himself by discussing the effect of slavery on learning, culture, and general intelligence on the basis of the history of slavery in America. At Liverpool, the center of Southern sympathizers, a city interested in commerce and trade and manufacture, the orator took as his central propositional idea: "Slavery strikes at the vital want of commerce —rich consumers." Slavery in the long run he declared to be hostile to commerce and manufacture all the world over as it was to free interests in society. Again Beecher revealed his ability to analyze the character of his audience and divine the springs of human action. The London speech was an exposition of the moral aspects of slavery. "The battle had been fought, and my address there was a good deal more of a religious address than anywhere else." This effort concluded Beecher's formal program and brought the series of orations to a climax in a trenchant appeal to England's love of popular liberty. "If the love of popular liberty is dead in Great Britain, you will not understand us; but if the love of liberty lives as it once lived, and has worthy successors of those renowned men that were our ancestors as much as yours, and whose examples and principles we inherit as so much seed corn in a new and fertile land, then you will understand. * * * If we are one in civilization, one

in religion, one substantially in faith, let us be one in national policy, one in every enterprise for the furtherance of the gospel and for the happiness of mankind."

I now turn to a consideration of the introductions and the methods used by Mr. Beecher to win a hearing from hostile audiences. At Manchester an audience of six thousand began to carry out the injunction of the placards to give the speaker a disgusting reception. The chairman had expressed his confidence that there was not an Englishman in that crowded hall who did not approve of a manly, moral, and good man wherever he was found; but peals of derision interrupted Beecher after his first sentence. Instantly the flint struck fire: "My friends, we will have a whole night session, but we will be heard!" The question was, who could hold out the longest. There were five or six storm centers boiling and whirling at the same time; here someone pounding on a group with his umbrella and shouting, 'Sit down there;' over there a row between two or three combatants; somewhere else a group all yelling together at the top of their voices. It was like talking to a storm at sea. * * * The uproar would come in on this side and on that, and they would put insulting questions and make all sorts of calls to me, and I would wait until the noise had subsided and then get in about five minutes of talk. * * * I think it was the design of the men there to break me down on that first speech by fair means or foul." But the orator registers a vow that he will not be broken down, and hurling his pointed spears of defiance at the enemy wins inch by inch the battle for free speech. Then quickly changing his tack, he covets the honor of having his name joined to that "great company of noble Englishmen from whom we derive our dictrines of liberty." He is gratified to make his initial appearance in the "goodly town of Manchester," for "in what town more than Manchester have the doctrines of human rights been battled for, and where else have there been gained for them nobler victories than here?" There are not words of indiscriminate praise, the phrases of a pandering flatterer. One feels the presence of a moral personality speaking honest and deserving compliment. If there is a suspicion of demagoguery or insincerity in this it is quickly checked by the subtlety of the third device of securing the confidence of his audience, for the orator expresses a reckless disregard for what Englishmen might thing of him personally or of his words and deeds, declaring that he owes a higher

reverence to personal fidelity to the duty of championing the poor and weak. "I have never stopped to measure and to think whether my words spoken in truth and fidelity to duty would be liked in this shape by one or another person either in England or America. I have had one simple honest purpose which I have pursued ever since I have been in public life, and that was with all the strength that God has given me to maintain the cause of the poor and the weak of my own country." After pursuing this advantage he returns to strike again the earlier note of defiance and independence: "But I am not on trial or defense. * * * I am before you willing to tell you what I think about England or any person in it." Immediately he hedges and denounces anything that might lead to war, appealing to his audience as blood relatives whom America loves. He traces the rise of American affection and admiration for England, pays an eloquent tribute to English men, and institutions. "What we had to dignify humanity, that made life worth having, were all brought from old England. * * * When we searched our principles, they all ran back to rights wrought out and established in England; when we looked at those institutions of which we were the most proud, we beheld that the very foundation stones were taken from the quarry of your history. * * * Now when we thought England was seeking opportunity to go with the South against us of the North, it hurt us as no other nation's conduct could hurt us on the face of the globe." Hereupon he strikes again the general tone of defiance and avows with fervor that the cause of constitutional government and of universal liberty was so dear, so sacred that they (the North) would give every child they had, and that if it were necessary to maintain this great doctrine of representative government in America, they would fly against the armed world—against England and France. The succeeding paragraph again mingles the attitudes of conciliation and defiance, for after assuring them that the darker days of embroilment between England are passed he declares: "We ask no help and no hindrance. * * * If you do not send us another musket nor another cannon, we have cannon that will carry five miles already. * * * All we say is, let England keeps hands off." The final paragraph of this introduction is a strong emotional appeal in the name of national honor, fidelity to solemn national trusts, popular intelligence, right doctrines of civil government, liberty of speech and press, honest farmers, and civil liberty in every part of the United

States. To gain these "it will be worth all the dreadful blood, and tears, and woe."

The same mingling of compliment, self-devotion to principle, and defiance of British power and opinion is manifested in the introduction of the Glasgow speech. The first paragraph is a eulogy of Scotland and from the viewpoint of persuasion will repay careful reading.

"No one who has been born and reared in Scotland can know the feeling with which, for the first time, such a one as I have visited this land, classic in song and in history. I have been reared in a country whose history is brief. So vast is it that one might travel night and day for all the week, and yet touch historic ground. Its history is yet to be written; yet to be acted. But I come to this land, which, though small, is as full of memories as the heaven is of stars, and almost as bright. There is not the most insignificant piece of water that does not make my heart thrill with some story of heroism, or some remembered poem; for not only has Scotland had the good fortune to have had men that knew how to make heroic history, but she has reared those bards who have known how to sing her fame. And every steep and every valley, and almost every single league on which my feet have trod, have made me feel as if I was walking in a dream. I never expected to feel my eyes overflow with tears of gladness, that I had been permitted in the prime of life to look upon dear old Scotland. For your historians have taught us history, your poets have been the charm of our firesides, your theologians have enriched our libraries; from your philosophers—Reid, Brown, and Stuart—we have derived the elements of our philosophy, and your scientific researches have greatly stimulated the study of science in our land. I come to Scotland almost as a Pilgrim would to Jerusalem, to see those scenes whose story had stirred my imagination from my earliest youth; and I can pay no higher compliment than to say that having seen some part of Scotland I am satisfied; and permit me to say that if, when you know me you are a thousandth part as satisfied with me as I am with you, we shall get along very well together."

What "affectation of soul" is produced by this paragraph? The lines move rhythmically and are full of figurative implication carefully designed to affect national sensibilities. The expression is not stilted or bombastic but is rather possessed of fine restraint and

absolute sincerity. This would have been a sufficient approach to an ordinary occasion but the speaker was able to proceed at once to his argument. More preparatory pleading was necessary, and he continued by explaining his purpose and intention of appealing to right principles and high moral conduct. "I have been arrayed without regard to consequences and to my own reputation or my own ease, against that which I consider the damning sin of my country, and the shame of human nature—slavery." This devotion to principle, he asserts, overrides all desire for popularity, and "if you do not want a man to express his honest sentiments fearlessly, then I do not want to speak to you." He then parallels further the methods used at Manchester, asserting his primary allegiance to God's principle of truth and justice in favor of which he would forsake his own country and disown Great Britain; and rising again to a climax of defiance: "If they bring war to us, they shall have war. We must oppose arms to arms. If Great Britain is for slavery, I am against Great Britain." But there is woven with this apparent recklessness honest compliment, for he remembers the France "who befriended us in our early trials" and Great Britain "to whom we can never repay the debt of love we owe her for these men who wrought out in fire and blood those very principles of civil liberty for which we are now contending."

Mr. Beecher deemed his Edinburgh audience the most docile of all, and found it unnecessary to use much preliminary pleading. The Introduction consists of two short paragraphs in which recapitulates the persuasive methods used before. Edinburgh he considers the "most picturesque city in the world;" declares that he is not a partisan seeking proselytes but is an apostle of truth, justice, liberty, and good morals. He then expresses toleration for the opinions of the audience and requests reciprocal tolerance from them.

The orator's experience at Liverpool was the most sensational and dangerous of all. "If I had supposed I had had a stormy time, I found out my mistake when I got there. Liverpool was worse than all the rest put together. My life was threatened, and I had communications that I had not better venture there. The streets were placarded with the most scurrilous and abusive cards. * * * There were men in the galleries and boxes who came armed, and some bold men on our side went up into those boxes and drew their knives and pistols and said to these young bloods: 'The first man that fires

here will rue it.' Of all confusions and turmoils I never saw the like in my life. I got control of the meeting in about an hour and a half, and then I had clear road the rest of the way. We carried the meeting, but it required a three hours' use of my voice at its utmost strength. I sometimes felt like a ship-master attempting to preach on board a ship through a speaking trumpet with a tornado on the sea and a mutiny among the men."[8] This speech is referred to in all chapters on Persuasion as a classical example of persuasion; and although the facts about this speech are well known, it may not be altogether amiss to attempt another analysis here. The point usually stressed is that Beecher secured his hearing by appealing to the English sense of Fair Play; but more strategy than this was used as shown by the following outline:

1. My life has not been safe south of the Mason and Dixon line because of my solemn, earnest, persistent testimony against that which I consider the most atrocious thing under the sun—the system of American slavery in a free Republic.
2. (Upon a roar from the audience) I perceive that Southern influence prevails to some extent in England.
3. If a man's cause would bear examination he would have it spoken about.
4. The placards on your streets prove that you are afraid to submit your case to the arbiter of free speech; you appeal to mob law.
5. It is of no personal concern to me whether I speak here or not.
6. If you do let me speak you will hear plain talking.
7. Englishmen favor manly opposition and not the opposition of a sneak.
8. I will appeal to your reason, not your emotions.
9. Therefore, all I ask is Fair Play.

The above is an analysis of the skill and tact and judgment of Beecher in gaining the attention and hearing of hostile and prejudiced audiences. It may be true that the speaker today is not called before howling and hissing crowds, but all the principles utilized by the great American orator may be applied on a lesser scale to even normal occasions.

And now, finally, I wish to outline the argument of the speeches and show Beecher's further persuasive skill in stating those propositions that touched off highly charged tendencies in his hearers, and his especial ability to give these ideas their highest acceptance value

[8] Patriotic Addresses. "Account of the English Speeches." P. 646.

by clothing them with vivid detail. I shall state the topics of the outline quite fully and shall place in the footnotes supporting quotations from the text that will indicate adequately the sharp and vivid manner in which Beecher drove home his arguments. I do not think it is necessary to expatiate upon these outlines, for they in themselves amply demonstrate the principles of persuasion with which readers of this article are familiar. As the title indicates this is intended to be nothing more than a footnote in psychology of persuasion.

MANCHESTER.

(October 9, 1863)

I. The Civil War is a conflict between liberty and slavery,—a contest for liberty and against slavery,—to scourge oppression and establish liberty. Union in the future means justice, liberty, popular rights.

A. At the time of our great struggle for independence, the whole public mind began to think it was wrong to wage war to defend our rights while we were holding men in slavery.

1. All the great and renowned men were abolitionists.
2. Slavery was terminated in Massachusetts by a decision of the Chief Justice.
3. New York freed her slaves by an Emancipation Act.

b. Later New Jersey and Pennsylvania passed emancipation acts.

(Ref.) B. The claim that Northern capital and ships were employed in the slave trade is true to a certain extent, but

1. There are miscreants who violate the public conscience in every community.
2. Since then any man engaged in this infamous traffic hid himself—he would have been branded with the mark of Cain.
3. The port of New York was under the influence of that Democratic party in alliance with Southern slavery—under the dark political control of the South itself, for

a. The South could appoint our marshals and control the appointment of every Federal offifficer.

Conclusion: "Is New York to be blamed for demoniac deeds done by her limbs while yet under the possession of the devil? She is now clothed and in her right mind. There was one Judas: is Christianity a hoax? There are hissing men in this audience: are you not respectable?

C. The Constitution of the United States does not recognize *doctrine* of slavery in any way whatsoever.[9] The slave laws declare him to be chattel (which is cattle with the h left out); but the Constitution of the United States calls him person.[10]

D. The tide of universal emancipation was stopped by
   1. The wonderful demand for cotton throughout the world when, from the invention of the cotton gin, it became easy to turn it to service.[11]
   2. A political system that permitted the South to obtain federal representation for persons and things together.

E. I can say, under God, the South had unintentionally done more than we to bring on this work of emancipation, for
   1. The South began to preach the doctrine of Calhoun—the duty of general government to protect the local states from interference and to make slavery *equally* national with liberty.[12]
   2. The South began to assert rights never before dreamed of, for
      a. They waged the Mexican war for territory.
      b. They annexed Texas as a slave state.

[9] "It (slavery) was a fact; it lay before the ship of state, as a rock lies in the channel of the ship as she goes into the harbor; and because a ship steers around a rock, does it follow that the rock is in the ship? And because the Constitution of the United States made some circuits to steer around that great fact, does it follow that therefore slavery is recognized in the Constitution as a right or system?"

[10] "But how does the Constitution of the United States, when it speaks of these same slaves, name them? Does it call them chattel or slaves? Nay, it refused even the softer words serf and servitude. * * * Go to South Carolina, and ask what she calls slaves, and her laws reply, 'They are *things;*' but the old capitol at Washington sullenly reverberates, 'No, *persons!*' Go to Mississippi, the state of Jefferson Davis, and her fundamental law pronounces the slave to be only a 'thing;' and again the Federal Constitution sounds back, 'Persons!' Go to Louisiana and its constitution, and still that doctrine of devils is enunciated—it is 'chattel,' it is 'thing.' Looking upon those for whom Christ felt mortal anguish in Gethsemane, and stretched himself out for death on Calvary, their laws call them 'things' and 'chattels;' and still in tones of thunder the Constitution of the United States says, 'Persons!'"

[11] "Slaves that had been worth from three to four hundred dollars began to be worth six hundred dollars. That knocked away one-third of adherence to moral law. Then they became worth seven hundred dollars, and half the law went; then eight or nine hundred dollars, and then there was no such thing as moral law; then one thousand or twelve hundred dollars, and slavery became one of the beatitudes."

[12] "The South, having the control of the government, knew from the inherent weakness of their system, that, if it were confined, it was like huge herds feeding on small pastures that soon gnaw the grass to roots, and must have other pasture or die. Slavery is of such a nature that if you do not give it continual change of feeding ground, it perishes."

c. They organized rowdyism in Congress that browbeat every Northern man who had not sworn fealty to slavery.

d. They filled all the courts of Europe with ministers holding slave doctrines.

e. They gave a majority of the seats on the bench to slave-owning judges.

f. They forced the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill for the purpose of humbling the North and making it drink the bitter cup of humiliation.

g. They abolished the Missouri Compromise as an infamous disregard of solemn contract.

F. The conduct of the free North during all these days was honorable, for

1. No steps for secession were taken.
2. We threatened no violence.
3. We protested and waited and said: "God will give us the victory."
4. We never taxed their commerce or touched it with our little finger.

G. When Mr. Lincoln, in fair open field, was elected President of the United States, the conduct of the South was dishonorable, for

1. By political jugglery every state was precipitated into secession.

Summary: Against all these facts it is attempted to make England believe that slavery had nothing to do with this war. You might have attempted to persuade Noah that the clouds had nothing to do with the flood; it is the most monstrous absurdity ever born from the womb of folly.

II. Refutation: The assertions of Lord Wharcliffe are without foundation, for

A. It is indeed true that the South has been tending to support the existence of slavery.[13] There can be no question that there is a strong impression that the South has supported the existence of slavery. (Indeed on our side of the water there are many persons who affirm it.)

[13] In beginning this refutation of Lord Wharcliffe's speech (Wharcliffe was President of the (English) Society for Independence), Beecher said: "I never like to speak behind a man's back. I wish Lord Wharcliffe were present."

1. The South maintains four million slaves.[14]
2. The Montgomery Constitution is changed from the old Federal Constitution only to declare that it is unconstitutional to do away with slavery.
3. The speech of Vice-President Stephens declares that all nations have been mistaken, and to trample on the manhood of an inferior race is the only proper way to maintain the liberty of a superior.[15]

B. It is not true that the strongest supporters of slavery are the merchants of New York and Boston, for

1. Although there have been enough Northern ships engaged, not all nor the most were Northern.
2. Ships fitted out in New York were just as much despised and loathed and hissed by the honorable merchants of that great metropolis, as if they had put up the black flag of piracy.

Conclusion: Does it conduce to good feelings between two nations to utter such slanders as these?

C. It is untrue that the slave is put in a worse position in the North than in the South, for[16]

1. Although there has been a prejudice against the Negro in the North—although I concede most frankly there has been occasion for such a statement, it is a part of the great moral revolution that is going on that the prejudices have in great measure been vanquished and are now well nigh trodden down.

[14] The argument here is deeply tinged with irony: "—there are uncharitable men living who think that a nation that has four million slaves has some 'tendency' to support slavery."

[15] "—in which he (Stephens) lays down to Calvary a new lesson; in which he gives the lie to the Savior himself, who came to teach us, that by as much as a man is stronger than another, he owes himself to that other. * * * This audacious hierarch of an anti-Christian gospel, Mr. Stephens,—in the face of God, and to the ears of all mankind, in this day of all but universal Christian sentiment,—pronounces that for a nation to have manhood, it must crush out liberty of an inferior and weaker race."

[16] Note the irony of this paragraph. Wharcliffe had declared in his address that he knew from *experience* that the slave was in a worse position in the North than in the South. Beecher says: "I was never aware that he had been put in that unhappy situation. Has he toiled on the sugar plantation? Has he taken the night for his friend, avoiding the day? Has he sped thru cane brakes, hunted by hounds, suffering hunger, and heat, and cold by turns, until he has made his way to the far Northern States? Has he had this experience? If his lordship says that it is his *observation*, I will accept the correction."

2. The condition of the free colored people in the North is unspeakably better than in the South, for
   a. They own their wives and children.
   b. They have the right to select their place and their kind of labor.
   c. The right of education is accorded to them.

Conclusion: "I have endeavored to show you that slavery was the real cause of the war, and that if it had to be legally decided whether the North or South were guilty in this matter, there could be no question before any honourable tribunal, any jury, any deliberate body, that the South, from beginning to end, for the sake of slavery, has been aggressive, and the North patient. * * * The North went into the war for the Union with the distinct and expressed conviction on both sides that if the Union were maintained slavery could not live long."

GLASGOW.

(October 13, 1863)

Introduction: Paves the way for a clear understanding of his argument.

I. The slave states may be divided into two classes
   A. The farming states—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and parts of Tennessee and North Carolina—are devoted to a mixed husbandry and the grazing of herds of cattle. Slave labor is not profitable but slave-breeding is.
   B. The plantation states—South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas—do not pursue a mixed husbandry, but raise chiefly the two great crops, cotton and sugar.[17]

II. The labor of slaves in the farming states does not pay, for
   A. Mixed farming requires much more skill than slaves have.
   B. Slaves are too costly, for in the farming states they are better off and a man is expensive just in proportion as he rises in the scale of civilization.

III. The reason that slaves are kept in the North is that slave breeding is profitable.
   A. Virginia has raised as much as $24,000,000.00 a year for slaves sold South.

[17] "They buy the principal part of their food and almost all manufactured products. The pails they carry their water in are made in New England; their broom handles, their pins, glass, stone, iron, and tinware, and all their household furniture, are the manufacture of the North."

1. The editor of the Virginia "Times" gives authority to this statement.[18]
2. Henry Clay, a slave holder, testified to the profit of slave breeding in 1829.

Discussion:

IV. Slavery requires ignorance in the slave—intellectual, moral, and social,
   A. Not because intelligence is more difficult to govern, for
      1. With an intelligent people government is easier.
      2. (Restatement) The slave would not be less easily governed if he were educated.
   B. But because the most ignorant slave is the *cheapest* slave, and to make slave labor profitable, you must reduce the cost of the slave.[19]

V. The degradation of the slave affects all labor, even when performed by free white men, for
   A. Even in the most favored portions of the South manual labor is but barely redeemed from the taint of being a slave's business, for
      1. The poor and shiftless whites, unable to own slaves, unwilling to work themselves, live in a precarious and wretched manner, but a little removed from barbarism.
   B. The great and free North is a vast hive of universal industry.[20]

VI. The claim of the South that the North's prosperity is due to class legislation and Yankee shrewdness is unsound, for
   A. The country's legislation for fifty years has been controlled by the South.[21]

[18] "You cannot understand anything about slavery until you are admitted to the secrets of raising slaves as colts and calves are raised for the market."

[19] "In order to make slave labor profitable, you must reduce the cost of the slave; for the difference between the profit and the loss turns upon the half-penny per pound. If the price of the slave goes up, and cotton goes down a shade in price, in ordinary times the planters lose. The rule is, therefore, to reduce the cost of the man; and the slave to be profitable must be simply a working creature. What does a man cost, that is a slave? Just a little meal, and a little pork, a small measure of the coarsest cloth and leather, that he is all he costs. Because that is all he needs—the lowest fare and the scantiest clothing. *He is a being with two hands and two feet and a belly.*"

[20] "From Northern looms the South is clothed. From their anvils come all Southern implements of labor; from their lathes all modern ware; from their lasts Southern shoes."

[21] "The oration at this point rises to a fine climax: "Not only is it true that the workingmen of England have an interest in this conflict as a political struggle; but as a conflict between two grand systems—Slave labor and Free

VII. A historical ertrospect of public opinion in both the North and South will help make clear the true nature of the conflict now raging.

A. Northern opinion passed through three stages

1. At the close of the war for independence men were united in societies to promote the abolition of slavery. These died out in 1830 but were later revived with the purpose of promoting liberty and weakening slavery.
2. Another body of moral and intelligent men held that slavery should be limited to its former territory; for they thought that if slavery were rigorously confined to existing bounds natural laws would work out a system of emancipation.
3. There was a class without moral convictions who looked only at *interest* as the end of politics.

Conclusion: The Northern movement proposed no violence nor any precipitate action.

B. Southern opinion was divided into two divisions

1. The more moderate party attempted to maintain the South on the basis of slavery by the multiplication of slave states, by the acquisition of slave states, by the acquisition of slave territories, and by directing the government in such a manner as to fortify slavery till it should stretch across the continent from ocean to ocean.
2. The second party meant to break off from the Union as soon as they were strong enough. They designed, first, separate national existence as the ultimate aim of the Southern states; and secondly, the inclusion of the tropics of America in a gigantic cotton growing slave empire. * * * They meant to reopen the African slave trade for the purpose of cheapening negroes.[22]

labor—it addresses itself to every laboring man on the globe. * * * It is monstrous that British workmen should help Southern slaveholders to degrade labor. Are there not enough already to crush the poor and helpless laborers of the world without English workingmen, too, joining the revel gang of oppressors? Every word for the South is a word against the slave! Every stroke aimed at the slave rebounds upon the European laborer! * * * The North is truly fighting the battle of the laborer everywhere. The North honors work. When the laborer is educated, all doors are open to him, and it depends on his own powers and disposition whether he shall be a drudge or an honored citizen. It will be a burning shame for British workmen to side against their own friends!"

[22] Beecher felt sure that his audience condemned the African slave trade, and he therefore proceeded to stir feeling against the South by arguing that the domestic slave trade in the states was infinitely more cruel than the barter

IX. The second faction of the South have attempted to carry out their designs, for

A. The state legislatures were persuaded and intimidated to vote for secession.[23]

X. When the South opened their batteries on Fort Sumter, the grandeur of the uprising of the North was sublime, for

A. With stern unanimity the public voice denounced complicity with the South as a treason worthy of death.[24]

B. The government began to defend the laws and the constitution.[25]

which his audience for many years had looked upon with righteous indignation. "I declare that the inter-state slave trade of America is in many most important respects more cruel than the roughest part of the African slave-trade. To bring up men under the gospel, to bring up women with some of the tender susceptibilities of womanhood, and more than half their blood white blood,—to rear them in your household, and then,—if bankruptcy threatens, or exigences press, to call out your valuable slaves from a Virginia plantation and sell them to the slave master, to manacle them—to drive in gangs men reared under the sound of the bell of the Christian Church,—who have required something of refinement in their master's families—to carry them down South in droves of fifties and hundreds, as is done on every great street and road of the northern line of slave states,—is, I say, more infernal, more wicked, by as much as these northern-bred slaves are more tender, susceptible, and intelligent, than the poor half-imbruted African. If God sends one bolt at the ship that brings slaves from Africa, double-shotted thunders are aimed at every gang-master that drives them from the Northern slave states to the Southern."

[23] "When history shall be written, the fact will appear that numbers of convention members were made afraid for their lives. They were told in almost so many words, 'You shall never leave Richmond alive if you fail to vote secession.' It was voted, but secretly, and it was not known in Virginia for weeks. * * * It was to commit the South, to fire the wavering, and arouse the sectional blood, that orders were sent from Washington by the Southern conspirators who were lurking there—'Open your batteries of Fort Sumter.' And they fired at that glorious old flag which had carried the honor of the American name 'round the globe, in order that they might take Virginia out of the Union, and compel the North to submit either to a degrading compromise, or to the independence of the South."

[24] "No rainbow was ever so decked with color as was Broadway with flags. Bunting went up in the market. * * * It is said that misery makes one acquainted with strange bedfellows, but patriotism makes even stranger transformations. I found men that were ready to mob me yesterday for my anti-slavery agitations, ready to denounce me today because I was not anti-slavery enough."

[25] "If they had failed to do this, if when the government and country were threatened by this rebellion they had faltered, not Judas, not the meanest traitor that has ever been execrated thru all time, would have surpassed them in ignominy. I have been asked would it not have been better to negotiate? What! with cannon balls firing right into your midst! The other side was using powder and balls, and you propose to use wad and paper! The day for talking was gone by forever. They had talked too much already. It was then the day for action."

Refutation:

XI. Men ask me why did you not consent to let them (South) go. Because

A. Only on the single matter of slavery is there any antagonism —and this we believe to be a removable evil.

B. Secession was an appeal from the ballot to the bullet.

C. Instances of colonies in the past asserting their independence are not good analogies, for

1. A remote colony, an outlying and separate territory, whose autonomy is already practically established, and whose connection with the home government is not intimate, territorial, adjacent, but only political is not to be compared to home territory, geographically touching the country along its whole line.[26]

XII. I shall now refer to the astonishing pretense made in England that this war has nothing to do with slavery. This is not true, for

A. Never has the South asserted this.

B. Her politics for thirty years have avowedly and indisputably moved around that center.

C. All her principal statesmen having made interferences with slavery wrongs at the hands of the North the reason of rebellion—the whole interior history of America for fifty years has been wound up on this speel.[27]

Conclusion: The triumph of the North means the triumph of free institutions. "If the North prevails, she carries over the continent her pirde of honest work, her free public schools, her homestead law; her free press, her love and habit of free speech, her untiring industry, her thrift, frugality, and morality, and above all her democratic ideas of human rights, and her old English notions

[26] "This is not cutting off a foot, or a hand. It is cutting across the body right under the heart. The line of fracture proposed by the South is not a stone's throw from the national capitol. France might consent to let Algiers go, but would she let a north and south line be run touching the city of Paris on the east, and separating all the territory east from her dominions? Great Britain might suffer the Canadas to secede from the crown; but would she suffer an east and west line to be run along the edge of London, and all the territory south of it to pass into hostile hands? Yet this is the very case in America. Secession accomplished will leave Washington toppling on the edge of the Southern abyss in whose lurid future loom the elements of quarrel, collision, and terrific war."

[27] "Slavery has been the very alphabet of the war. Every letter of its history has been taken from the font of slavery! The whole black literature of the war has been drawn from slavery!"

of a commonwealth, transmitted to her from Sydney, Hampden, Vane, Milton; and not least, her free churches, with their vast train of charities and beneficences!"

XII. But I return to the shameless and impudent assertion that the North is not sincere in this conflict.

A. There has never before, since time began, been a spectacle like that in America, for

1. One million men are on foot either in the army or navy—every man a volunteer.[28]

XIII. But, it is asked, since the South is so utterly discordant with the North, why not let her go and have peace? But

A. It is to stay that she is fighting. If we let her go she will stay.[29]

B. There would divide us only a fiery line of a slave empire charged with the flames and thunder of war, ready to explode on any occasion.[30]

C. Slaves would run across the line and the South would be irritated if we harbor them.

D. Our press would not be less bold in its proclamation of doctrines of liberty.

Conclusion: Cruel as the war is, yet to stop it until slavery has its death wound would be even more cruel.[31]

[28] "They have come, not like the Goths and Huns from a wandering life or inclement skies, to seek fairer skies and richer soil; but from homes of luxury, from cultivated farms, from busy workshops, from literary labors, from the bar, the pulpit, and the exchange, thronging around the old national flag that had symbolized *liberty* to mankind, all moved by a profound love of country, and firmly and fiercely determined that the mother-land shall not be divided, especially not that in order that slavery may scoop out for itself a den of refuge from Northern civilization, and an empire to domineer over all the American tropics."

[29] "No mountains divide the North from the South—they run the other way. No cross rivers divide them—they run the other way. * * * God has affianced the torrid and temperate zones in America one to the other, and they are always running into each other's arms."

[30] "Well, may be—may be—*you* could lie down on a powder magazine, with a thousand tons of powder in it, and a fire raging within an inch of it, but *I* could not!"

[31] "When the surgeon has cut half the cancer out, is that man the friend of the patient, who, seeing the blood and hearing the groans, should persuade him to leave the operation half performed, and bind up the cancered limb? But, you ask, How long shall we carry violence into the South? I will ask you a question in reply. If in the purlieus of vice in old Glasgow there should be a ward of which a confederation of burglars and thieves had taken possession, how long would you invade it with your police? Would Glasgow give up to them or would they have to give up to Glasgow?"

IX. Final Summary: You ought to give your support to the North, for

A. You have supported Greece, Poland, and Hungary when fighting for the same principles of liberty.

B. The North is fighting to establish principles of moral law, not principles of technical law.[32]

C. Great Britain is tied to America by ties of kindred blood and should not put herself in a position where she cannot be in cordial and ever-during alliance with the free republic in America. (I do not undertake to teach the law that governs the question; but this I do undertake to say, and I will carry every generous man in this audience with me, when I affirm that if between America, bent double with the anguish of this bloody war, and Great Britain, who sits at peace, there is to be forbearance on either side, it should be on your side.)

LIVERPOOL.

(October 16, 1863)

Introduction: The things required for prosperous labor, prosperous manufacturers and prosperous commerce are three.

I. Liberty—to follow those laws of business which experience has developed without imposts or restrictions or governmental intricacies.

II. Liberty—to distribute and exchange products of industry in any market without burdensome tariffs, without imposts and without vexatious regulations.

III. Liberty—of an intelligent and free race of customers, for (Let us put the subject before you in the familiar light of your own local experience.)

[32] "I do not discuss this as a question of technical law at all. I lift it up and put it on the ground of moral law. Between two parties, one of whom is laboring for the integrity and sanctity of labor, and the other is for robbery, the degradation of labor, and the integrity of slavery,—I say that the man that gives his aid to the Slave Power is allied to it, and is making his money by building up tyranny. Every man that strikes a blow on the iron that is put in those shops for the South, is striking a blow and forging a manacle for the hand of a slave. * * * You are false to your own principles, to your own interests, to mankind and to the great working classes. * * * You strike God in the face when you work for slaveholders. Your money so got and quickly earned will be badly kept, and you will be poor before you can raise your children, and dying you will leave a memory that will rise against you at the day of judgment. By the solemnity of that judgment—the sanctity of conscience—by the love you bear to humanity—by your old hereditary love of liberty;—in the name of God and mankind, I charge you to come out from among them, to have nothing to do with the unclean and filthy lucre made by pandering to slavery."

A. The ignorant and poor man buys simply for his body.

B. The educated and prosperous man buys in greater quantity for he buys for the satisfaction of sentiment and taste as well as senses.[33]

Conclusion: That nation is the best customer that is freest because freedom works prosperity, industry, and wealth. Great Britain, then, aside from moral considerations, has a direct commercial and pecuniary interest in the liberty and civilization and wealth of every people and every nation on the globe. * * * Of course you do have an interest in this because you are a moral and religious people.

Discussion:

IV. It is a great deal more important for Great Britain to have customers than cotton. (It is to this doctrine I ask from you business men, practical men, men of fact, sagacious Englishmen—to that point I ask a moment's attention.)

A. Since there are no more continents to be discovered, you must civilize the world in order to make a better class of purchasers.

1. If you were to press Italy down again under the feet of despotism, Italy, discouraged, could draw but very few supplies from you.[34]

2. If Hungary asks to be an unshackled nation she will rise in virtue and intelligence, for her Liberty is to be found in the Price Current.

3. Every free nation, every civilized people—every people

[33] "The law of price is the skill; and the amount of skill expended in the work is as much for the market as are the goods. A man comes to the market and says, 'I have a pair of hands,' and he obtains the lowest wages. Another man comes and says, 'I have something more than a pair of hands; I have truth and fidelity'; he gets a higher price. Another man comes and says, 'I have something more, I have something more; I have hands and strength, and fidelity, and skill.' He gets more than either of the others. The next man comes and says, 'I have hands and strength, and skill, and fidelity; but my hands work more than that. They know how to create things for the fancy, for the affections, for the moral sentiments'; and he gets more than either of the others . The last man comes and says, 'I have all these qualities, and have them so highly that it is a peculiar genius; and genius carries the whole market and gets the highest price.' * * * That nation is the best customer that is freest, because freedom works prosperity, industry and wealth."

[34] "But give her (Italy) liberty, kindle schools throughout her valleys, spur her industry, make treaties with her by which she can exchange her wine, and her oil, and her silk for your manufactured goods; and for every effort that you make in that direction there will come back profit to you by increased traffic with her."

that rises from barbarism to industry and intelligence, becomes a better customer.[35]

V. If the South became a slave empire what relation will it have to you? It will be a bad customer and affect you seriously, for

A. One-third of the population would be miserably poor, unbuying blacks, for whom you manufacture very little. (You have not got machinery coarse enough. Your labor is too skilled to manufacture bagging and linsey-woolsey.)

B. One-third of the population of the South consists of a poor, unskilled, degraded white population.

C. Only one-third are intelligent and rich customers that can afford to buy the kind of goods you bring to market.

Conclusion: If by sympathy or help you establish a slave empire—you sagacious Britons are busy in favoring the establishment of an empire from ocean to ocean that should have fewest customers and the largest non-buying population.

VI. The difference between free labor and slave labor is shown by a study of the difference of the two sections in cultivating land, for

A. Virginia with 15,000 more square miles than New York has 5,000 square miles less under cultivation.

B. Maryland with 2,000 more square miles than Massachusetts has only 800 square miles more under cultivation.

C. Georgia with 12,000 more square miles than Pennsylvania, has 5,600 less land under cultivation.

Conclusion: Now what can England make for the poor white population of such a future empire and for her slave population? What carpets, what linens, what cottons can you sell to them? A little bagging and a little linsey-woolsey and a few whips and manacles, are all you can sell to the slave.

(Ref.) VII. The claim that the interests of England consist in drawing from any country its raw material, is not the whole truth, for

[35] As people rise from barbarism to civilization they become better customers. "When you Christianize and civilize a man, you put story upon story, for you develop faculty after faculty; and you have to supply every story with your productions. The savage is a man one story deep; the civilized man is thirty stories deep. Now if you go to a lodging house where there are three or four men, your sales to them may no doubt be worth *something;* but if you go to a lodging house like some of those I saw in Edinburgh, which seemed to contain about twenty stories—every story of which is full, and all who occupy buy from you—which is the best customer, the man who is drawn out, or the man who is pinched up?"

A. When she (England) has put her brains into the cotton, and into the linen and flax ,and it becomes the product of her looms, a far more important question is, What can be done with it? *England does not want merely to pay prices for that which brute labor produces, but to get a price for that which brain labor produces.*

VIII. The claim that if the South should be allowed to be separate there will be no tariff and England can trade with her freely, but thtat if the South remains in the United States it will be bound by a tariff and English goods will be excluded from it, is fallacious; for

A. The first tariff policy proposed in the United States was proposed by the South. The tariff had its origin in Southern weaknesses and necessities.

B. There has not been a time for the whole of fifty years when any tariff could be passed without the aid of the South.

C. Before the war the thinking men of America were ready for free trade.

D. The Morrill tariff was made necessary to pay the millions of millions of imposed debt the South left to cramp the incoming of Lincoln.

E. Just as soon as we begin to have peace again, and can get our national debt into proper shape as you have yours * * * there is nothing more certain in the future than that America is bound to join with Great Britain in the world-wide doctrine of free trade.[36]

[36] This completes the principal argument of this speech. The remainder is a repetition for the most part of rebuttal argument outlined in the Glasgow speech.

THE CHICAGO HIGH SCHOOL LITERARY UNION

RALPH E. BLOUNT
Waller High School, Chicago, Illinois

FOR many years there has been among the Chicago high schools a literary league called the Chicago Literary Union. Its function has been to manage each year a series of contests in debate, extemporaneous speaking, declamation and reading. About half of Chicago's high schools are members of the league. Within the last few years some very radical changes have been made in the character of the work done. The new methods may prove of interest to other teachers who are conducting literary contests.

The most thorough-going change has been in debate. By the old method two teams of two speakers each spent five weeks in preparing a debate on a question which one team selected from three questions submitted by the opposing team. The debates were written out, committed to memory and practiced under the direction of a faculty coach. After the set speeches were delivered each speaker was given a few minutes for rebuttal.

The new method aims at the maintenance of a debating club in each school and at making the contest-meeting the climax of the season's practice in debating. In the fall three or four questions are chosen by the faculty board. These questions are studied and discussed by the debating club of each school for three or four months. Then a series of matches between schools is carried off in rapid succession, the schedule being made out so that each school shall speak two to four times. (A larger number, four to six, would perhaps be desirable.) About thirty hours before each debate an umpire chooses which of the questions studied and practiced shall be used, and assigns the sides. The design is to have the investigation and library work done during the months of study and practice. The few hours of preparation after the assignment of the question are to be spent in arranging the data and planning the campaign. It is not intended that the pupils shall write out their debates.

The speakers, three on each side, are allowed only one speech, limited to ten minutes, but the first affirmative is given four min-

utes for closing rebuttal. The other speakers are to divide their ten minutes as they wish between constructive speech and rebuttal.

The new method has been tried only two years and is likely to undergo some modification of detail. It aims to correct serious faults which are usual in prepared and memorized debates. Our pupils now must think "on their feet." They cannot so extensively quote and paraphrase the briefs and arguments of others. The contest is the climax of a long period of class or club work and fairly represents a regular school activity. Our new plan meets the general approval of those who understand it, though there are some pupils and even some teachers who cannot get away from the idea of writing out and memorizing the speeches. Our practice clubs and classes, a vital element in the scheme, are not yet well organized in all schools of the league.

The extemporaneous speaking contests are of the usual sort. Each school is represented by a team of three or four speakers. Each speaker selects a topic from a list of about twenty, and is allowed forty minutes for preparation. The speech is limited to five minutes. The team making the highest score is awarded the prize, and the pupil getting the best rank is given honorable mention.

It is the fashion now-a-days to decry the declamation and recitation. It is true that much crass and artificial work is done in this line, but that is no reason for giving up the exercise. It is a reason only for purging it. We do not permit farcical, highly dialectic, or musical pieces; and discourage over-wrought passion. We believe that pupils can profit by giving their interpretation of bits of literature which they have committed to memory as well as by reading with book in hand.

We have recently instituted a contest in sight reading. Preliminary announcement is made of the author from whom selections will be made. About an hour before the contest each pupil is given the selection he is to read, and is allowed the use of a dictionary in preparation. We aim to choose easy and interesting selections not over ten minutes in length.

An oratorical contest also is offered, though some years there are not the minimum number—five—of contestants required for carrying it out. The pupils write their orations, memorize, and deliver them. The judges read and grade the orations before the date

of the contest, and the mark thus given is given equal weight with the delivery grade in determining the final rank.

It has been found necessary to make very few rules governing the contests. Each advisory teacher is expected to keep his pupils within the established methods, though there is provision for an appeal to the faculty board governing the contests. Pupils must be doing creditable work in their studies; no one pupil may compete in two final contests in one year; a winning pupil may not enter the same contest another year.

A few years ago we pestered our friends whom we thought able and complaisant, to act as judges. For the more pretentious contests we tried to draft judges of minor courts. Ministers, lawyers, teachers, and business men were frequently obtained. Now we appeal directly to neighboring universities and schools of speaking to send us instructors and advanced students in the art of speaking and debating. We pay a small honorarium—not an adequate remuneration for the time given, but an evidence of our appreciation of the service. Under this plan our judges practically never fail to appear promptly. When requested, they give to the speakers private criticisms which are often very helpful. We formerly gave the judges explicit instructions for marking; now that we have expert judges, we give no instructions. Sometimes a judge seems rather young and not altogether judicious; but on the whole we find them very much more painstaking than the old style judges, and they are holding us up to better ideals of work. Clap-trap does not go with them.

We suffer from the difficulties which, I suppose, trouble all directors of contests: the pupils are sometimes so eager to win that they come to think the decision of the judges is the main thing and that they must by hook or crook get the verdict, forgetting courtesy and honor and losing sight of the joy of the game. It is up to us teachers to relate these contests to our other school work, to make them a stimulus and climax to our class instruction and to tone down the ardor of rivalry with the spirit of gentle courtesy. With some care and preparation we can reach the rooters as well as the team, and teach them to welcome the rival team with generous applause and to insist that they have every opportunity to do their best.

PROBLEMS IN TEACHING DEBATE

G. ROWLAND COLLINS
New York University

IN these days of uncertain educational values, it is a pleasure to be teaching an elective course in debate. Occasionally, it is true, one is forced to repel the attacks of curriculum reformers and manipulators, but seldom is he obliged to defend his course and its worth against the questionings of the undergraduate. There is no need for the teacher of debate to explain at length that the sole value of his course is in its training in mental discipline, and explanation which seldom fails to kill all interest in the subject on the part of 75% of all the members of the class. The students who elect work in debate are certain of the practical value of the course. They realize that training in debate is a practical preparation for a life of good citizenship. For all of which teachers of debate may well be thankful.

Most teachers realize the possibilities the subject offers in training for life, and aim "to make college debating more directly identical in character with the actual debating of practical life." An increasing effort is being made to break away from what is purely academic and to connect up college work in debate with the best work of this kind in life—in law, in politics, in business, in any field of life where ideas are attacked and defended. In this attempt to make debate more than a mere course in mental gymnastics many new problems have come into being.

To me, three of these problems have seemed particularly important. Two of them are actual teaching problems which have to do with methods. The third is not a problem in teaching, but it is a none the less important problem.

The first problem is what I shall call the problem of Imaginative and Suggestive Presentation. The application of the principles of psychology to the teaching of debate is a comparatively new thing. The work of Professor Covington, Professor Woolbert and others has made a valuable contribution to the material of presentation.

The use of imagination and suggestion in debate has opened up new possibilities to the progressive teacher. What use shall he make of these new ideas? How much class-room time can he afford to give to them? Can any of the present conventional stress on pure logic be omitted? These are questions which present themselves almost immediately.

At the outset, it must be remembered that the time allowed for a course in debate is short, too short, in fact. Time then will not permit the introduction of a mass of psychological material without the sacrifice of much of the logical. That is certain.

Then, too, if you stress, even in a small degree, the importance of imagination in argument, the place of feeling in debate, the emotional appeal, the tendency on the part of your students will be to give you nothing but pictures, images and elaborate word paintings. The inevitable tendency will be for your students to stop presenting facts and solid proof, and to depend upon mirroring or imaging their reasons. Why? Because the use of facts and solid proof means hard and disagreeable work, while the free and riotous use of the imagination is a pleasure. Now do not misunderstand me. I do not believe that one should adhere so rigidly to the traditional logical subject matter as to stifle every bit of creative imagination in the student. Not at all. The point is simply that I have found by actual experience that students will overemphasize the importance of imaginative and suggestive presentation if they are allowed anything like free rein.

I realize, of course, that the appeal to the "intellect" and the appeal to the "emotions" are both needed in effective persuasion. In the words of the psychologists, an effort should be made to get both an open response and a hidden response. In the past our college training in debate has not given enough attention to the "open level" appeal. But in the future, however, we must be careful not to give too much attention to it. Because of the newness and the attractiveness of the psychological material, there is danger that teachers will rush from one extreme to the other. Both "intellectual" and "emotional" appeals are necessary. It is, however, easier to develop the "emotional" appeal than the "intellectual" appeal. In fact, it is very difficult to hold the young debater down to sanity in the use of the "emotional" appeal. If it is easier to develop one

type of appeal without the other, we need to be particularly careful not to overemphasize that type of appeal which is more easily developed.

If then, the tendency on the part of the students is to let creative imaging replace logical thinking and solid research, it is well for the teacher not to minimize the attention paid to the traditional fundamentals. I believe with Ex-President Foster of Reed College, that "imperfect analysis and unsupported assertion are the two great weaknesses of argumentation." Anything which tends to encourage these two weaknesses needs to be handled with creat care. Our first duty in the short time at our disposal is to teach the fundamentals, to train the student in sound logical thinking and painstaking research.

But let us suppose that the course in Debate extends throughout the year and that there is sufficient time to emphasize the work in Imaginative and Suggestive Presentation. Even then, I am still to be persuaded that a great amount of training in getting emotional responses will be of any direct benefit to the student when he goes out into the world. Now I most certainly realize the value of the emotional appeal to what is commonly called the popular audience. But I ask you, how many of your debating students will have to deal with the popular audience in life? In nine cases out of ten in actual life, the college trained debater will deal *not* with the popular audience, but with an audience composed of men of his own kind—analytical, keen-thinking men who want to be shown the truth or falsity of a proposition by logical reasoning backed up by tested evidence. To such an audience attempts to image and suggest will be perfectly obvious appeals and will be brushed aside as unworthy of influencing judgment.

Suppose the college debater goes into business. What is the demand there? He must debate across the directors' table and in the committee room. He must prove by sound logic, facts and statistics. He must present his material in a very short time. He cannot stop long to image his reasons and to suggest associations. He must use his time to present the "meat" of his case. The one man in business who might be said to need training an imaginative and suggestive presentation is the advertising man. In this connection, however, is it not significant that one of the largest adver-

tising agencies in the United States has recently announced that hereafter it will write only what is called in the language of advertising "long circuit" or "reason-why" copy. It has reached the conclusion that "short circuit" emotional copy does not pay the advertiser. The demand in business is more and more for sound logical reasoning backed up by tested evidence.

Now let me make myself clear. I recognize the value of Imaginative and Suggestive Presentation, but I believe that the appeal in such presentation is to the popular audience principally. I am asking whether or not the popular audience actually exists for the debater in real life. How often do popular audiences gather to hear a pro and con discussion? The public lecture is still in demand, but the public lecture that is demanded is not one that seeks to persuade, but one that seeks to entertain. Popular audiences do come together for entertainment, but training to speak before such audiences is surely not the work of a course in debate. In the great majority of cases debating in life is carried on before small groups of people who want to hear in the shortest possible time the strongest possible case presented as regards reasons and facts. There is little time and little need for imaging. If the facts are presented the conclusion will be accepted.

Occasionally, of course, debates do take place in actual life before large popular audiences. Not more than two weeks ago I attended such a debate in the Lexington Avenue Theater in New York on the subject of the Open *vs.* the Closed Shop. The audience was largely made up of workers, members of trades unions. They were bitterly prejudiced against the Open Shop. The speaker for the Closed Shop used a picturing, imaging, emotional appeal throughout. His words were received with wild applause. He did not need to use logical reasoning or cumulative evidence. The majority of the audience were in sympathy with his case. On the other hand, the speaker for the Open Shop used no emotional appeal, but based his entire case on analytical reasoning, backed up by facts. The task of persuading that prejudiced audience to accept the principle of the Open Shop was an impossible one, but the speaker *did* make a decided impression upon the unionists. Expressions of respect for his reasoning ability were heard on every side as the audience left the theater. That speaker would prob-

ably have made no impression whatever if he had used an emotional appeal. That popular audience would have seen through such an attempt in an instant. The Closed Shop speaker could use Imaginative and Suggestive Presentation because the majority of the audience had already made its decision. The Open Shop speaker by straight argument shook the beliefs of the prejudiced and probably persuaded every unprejudiced person in the audience. The Closed Shop speaker entertained his audience and little more. The Open Shop speaker faced the hardest kind of a debating problem, the prejudiced audience, and he made an impression upon it.

These then are my views on the problem of what to do with matters of Imaginative and Suggestive Presentation in a course in debate. I believe that we should not omit consideration of the new material that is being given us by the psychologists, but that we should be very careful to see to it that our consideration of this material does not force us to minimize solid training in logical reasoning, briefing, and the use of evidence. I believe that in the debating of actual life there is no great need for imaginative reasoning and the emotional appeal. I believe that if we emphasize Imaginative Presentation to the detriment of analysis, classification, and logical synthesis, we are catering to the development of that American credulity which Dr. Eliot has so recently attacked. We are encouraging the herd impulse, the common emotion response. We are not doing what we should do to train our students in straight thinking and hard work.

The second teaching problem which has seemed important to me is the problem of extempore speaking in debate. Here also, I believe that a word of caution is necessary. Many, many sins have been committed in the name of extempore debating. My own experience has been so definite that I am entirely persuaded that as for me, the problem is not how to develop extempore debating, but how to suppress it. Extempore debating for the undergraduate usually means extempore thinking. It places a premium on wordiness and superficiality. It brings to the fore the man who can talk long and say little. To me, one of the greatest obstacles to the progress of speech education in debate, is the continual spouting deluge of words which pours forth from the mouth of the shallow extempore debater.

I believe that we need to get right down to bed rock to examine our ideas as to extempore speaking in debate. We say that we are all agreed that extempore rebuttal is the thing to strive for. When pressed we admit that extempore rebuttal is not good unless it cuts straight through the non-essentials to the heart of the question at issue. Honestly and frankly, how many extempore debaters have you heard who could produce such a rebuttal? Have you ever heard an extempore rebuttal in which there was not a great mass of verbiage, and which would not have benefited greatly by revision? Lately I have been wondering whether or not our reverence for extempore speaking in general is not based upon the faulty belief that we often hold in regard to writing. I refer to the idea that speed and facility are the prime requisites—to the impression that if a thing is quickly done it is well done. I am very much afraid that it is because we teachers conscious or unconsciously hold the pestilent notion that the finest productions of the mind are the fruits of sudden inspiration, the chance visitations of a fortunate moment, the flashings of intuition, that so many people are at all times ready to mount the platform and afflict the public with "great mouthfuls of spoken wind."

But you may say, "You are not talking about true extempore debating; you are talking about impromptu debating. Extempore speaking in debate presumes serious preparation." True extempore speaking in debate does imply preparation. But even with that preparation, if thought is not given to the exact word expression of the ideas, is it possible to approach maximum effectiveness? I say No, decidedly. I have had debaters prove it to me time and time again. Take your ablest debater, have him study a proposition for a month, and then ask him to give you some extempore rebuttal on a certain point. His first attempt will be a scattering, wordy, ineffective talk. Then send him out of the room and tell him to think over what he has said. Tell him that you will hear his rebuttal again in a few minutes, but that you are going to cut down his time of speaking exactly one half. After ten or fifteen minutes, call him back into the room and ask him to refute the same point. You will find that his second talk will be at least 100% more effective than his first, though given in half the time. What has happened? Your debater has thought out the word ex-

pression of his ideas. He has written the words down in his mind and memorized them more or less. Now ask him to write out a refutation of the same point, striving for clearness and power. Have him read the written material over two or three times, then ask him to deliver this refutation, and you will have the greatest possible effectiveness from that speaker. Have him go through the same process on all the important points. Instead of making him entirely dependent upon sudden inspiration, this sort of practice makes him an effective debater. In the actual debate, only a few extempore connecting and adjusting sentences are necessary. The result is a refutation which seems spontaneous, a refutation which wastes not a word nor a second, a refutation which is effective.

But what about extempore debating in actual life? It is my contention that seldom do you have extempore speaking in the debates of actual life. A man is almost never asked to speak for or against a proposition about which he knows little. And no matter how well informed the speaker may be, seldom does he come to his talk without first thinking over exactly what he is going to say. Perhaps he does not actually write the words down on paper, and memorize them from it, but he usually delivers the talk over and over again to himself so many times that he has done almost the same thing—he has planned the word expression of his thoughts and memorized phrases and sentences. I firmly believe that the debater should pay definite attention to the phrasing of his ideas in advance of his talk. Revision makes for true effectiveness. While some of the clergymen of New York City twitter extemporaneously through forty minutes to establish their points to empty pews, others move thousands with the force of their expressed thoughts even though they are confined to the manuscript in delivery.

Truly the teacher of debate needs to be careful not to give extempore speaking undue emphasis. I believe that the reason many of us devote so much time to extempore debating is because we are downright lazy as teachers, and that the reason so many of our students praise the extempore work is because they are downright lazy as students. It is easy to use the class hour in extempore work. It is easy to keep the interest of the students by extempore

work in a great variety of subjects. The variety appeals. But surely we teachers of debate cannot do the easy think only and long hold our self-respect.

I believe that each student should be given one proposition each semester, and one proposition only. I believe that he should work out a thorough argument for and against that proposition. His arguments should be revised again and again, until they are made as nearly perfect in effectiveness as is possible. I believe that the instructor should work with the student, that he should investigate for himself and not merely act as a judge on what the student discovers. I believe that the instructor should suggest various methods of approach, various possibilities of arrangement, and that in every case the different methods of handling the material should be tried out on the class as a whole. I believe that the student should debate his proposition, formally, at least three times, each time, if possible, before different sections of the class. This means time and work on the part of the teacher, but if the course in debate is not worth time and work, it is not worth teaching.

Let me call your attention to another problem, a problem that is not one in teaching methods. It is, however, one upon which I feel very strongly, and one which, in my opinion, is worth an entire paper in itself. It is *this*, what should be the relation of the teacher of debate to the college or university intercollegiate debating teams? Here is a question that many teachers of debate try to dodge. May I say that I do not believe that one can simply dismiss the problem with the remark that intercollegiate debating is a student matter. I believe that the teacher of debate must take an active and interested part in the coaching of the intercollegiate debating teams. Debating and the teaching of debate is being discredited to-day by the frightful exhibitions of undirected intercollegiate debating which are so common.

Intercollegiate debating at present is not performing its true function. Right here let me quote from an exceedingly fair statement of the matter by Professor O'Neill.

'Both for those who participate and those who listen, contests in debate should be helpful toward higher standards, better ideals, greater ability in this field. * * * Their function is properly educational, and they should not be allowed to be diverted from their

really great educational end. When we neglect their possibilities as educational agencies and prostitute them to mere advertising and cheap 'sporting' ends, we are committing an offense as great as any of the outrages that characterized the worst days of athletic rivalry. Now it is only by making them approximate as nearly as possible in character and conduct, the best debates of actual life that we can hold them true to this educational purpose."

Are the intercollegiate debates of the present setting higher standards? I must confess that I doubt it. What is the present status of intercollegiate debating? In many of our eastern colleges and in at least two of the first universities of the nation, the control of intercollegiate debating is entirely in the hands of the students. What is the result? A proposition is decided upon about two or three weeks in advance of a good date. The teams prepare as best they can possibly with the assistance of a graduate debater who happens to be in the neighborhood. The debate takes place, and consists of challenges, assertions, and facetious rebuttal. The delivery is conversational. Yes, but stumbling and halting—nerve-racking to the listener.

During the present year New York University received a challenge to debate within two weeks time the proposition: Resolved, that the United States should invite the A. B. C. powers to co-operate in establishing a joint protectorate over Haiti. I submit that it is impossible for students to prepare a worthwhile debate on such a proposition in two weeks and at the same time keep up in their class-room work, and carry on the other outside activities in which they may be engaged. It happens that our intercollegiate debating squad has been working on the Haitian question for 3 months, and I do not consider that we are too ready to debate it even now.

Again, under student control, there is continual bickering and jockeying to gain advantages in wording and defining the proposition. This year, in what should be the most notable triangular debating arrangement of the United States, a misunderstanding of definition came up but three or four days before the actual debate. The proposition debated was the general subject of the Open vs. the Closed Shop. To gain desired advantages over certain opponents the student debating committee of the university whose

duty it was to word the proposition, framed it negatively: Resolved, that the employers of the United States should abandon the principle of the open shop. By the definition of the term "open shop" the issues were entirely changed so that the proposition came down to this: Resolved, that the employers of the United States should abandon the principle of not recognizing the trade unions. The inevitable result of this sort of thing is a debate in which there is little real clash, and in which there is an unpleasant squabble over definitions to the discomfiture of a badly confused audience.

Do such contests set before those who hear them the good examples of public discussion which Professor O'Neill says that they should? Hardly, and if these contests continue to be the rule, it will be but a short while before no one will come to hear them. Of late, debates before an audience which is composed of three judges, two alternates, and a few stragglers have been all too numerous.

The development of the twenty-four hour debate and its control by the students has not helped matters any. I have heard a number of twenty-four hour debates, but I have yet to hear one in which there was any direct clash, any effective debating. In almost every case the issues were clouded by the ignorance of the debaters. I am tempted to be concrete again. Within the present month a twenty-four hour intercollegiate debate was held in New York City on the proposition: Resolved, That Labor Unions be exempted from Anti-Trust Legislation. Now it happens that the Supreme Court of the United States in January of this year decided in the Duplex case, that the Clayton Act does not exempt Labor Unions from Anti-Trust Legislation. One of the teams debating in this debate knew nothing of the Duplex case, and the other knew so little about it that any effective use of it was impossible. Throughout the evening the following phrase was bandied from one side to the other: "The burden of proof is not upon us for we uphold the *status quo*." Both teams upheld the *status quo* and both teams were ignorant of what the *status quo* was. The phrase *status quo* became a signal for laughter on the part of the audience. It laughed at the absurdities of reasoning, and at the feeble attempts at refutation. Such a condition is not a healthy one

for intercollegiate debating, particularly when the spectacle is staged by two of the leading universities in the east.

The responsibility for the standards maintained in intercollegiate debating is ours—as teachers of debate. I know that there is no harder work than honestly coaching an intercollegiate debating squad. It is easy to dodge that work, but as teachers in the particular field we cannot afford to dodge it. We cannot meet the men once or twice, give them a few suggestions and let it go at that. We must buckle down and work with them. We must see to it that the man who represents the practice of the art we are teaching, is capable of doing it creditably. We must set standards and adhere to them. Our work is largely judged, whether we will or no, by the showing of the intercollegiate debaters. How many people in the audience or in the university know whether or not we have had any hand in coaching the team? The supposition is that we *have*. How many people know whether or not a certain debater has taken our course in debate? The supposition is that he *has*. In self protection it behooves the teacher of debate to realize the proper relation to intercollegiate debating. Let us not shirk, but put our hands to the task and saw wood.

EDITORIAL

"WHAT WE ALREADY KNOW"

THE editor confesses himself frankly puzzled. He is besought to "make THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL interesting for everybody," and then urged from time to time to beware this or that kind of material. His sincere aim is to put out a magazine that has something in it for everybody in the profession. Yet he finds himself confronted with two seemingly insuperable barriers; contributors do not see to it that the editorial barrel is supplied with material of all kinds out of which a fully balanced number can be made; and then when he thinks he has made it balance, someone rises to protest that there is too much of this or that kind of stuff in it. What is the answer?

Take a concrete case. A letter received the other day said this, "We do not so much need research as we need to spread what we already know." This statement accompanied an article that was of the very essence of research! But more than that, the article contained flat and positive statements that many teachers will contradict promptly and with joy. In other words, it purported to be "what we already know" but would not by any means be received with approval by those who think they too know. Thus it is rich in meat for the researcher. But in addition to all this it comes accompanied by a letter-head that bears the legend, "Studies in ————!"

So THE JOURNAL will, for this years at least, contain as much of something for everybody as contributors will make possible.

MORE PROGRESS

TWO events have occurred which merit notice in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL. The Northwestern School of Oratory has changed itself into the Northwestern School of Speech, and has adopted a four-year course leading to a special degree of B. L. The work of the College of Speech will articulate with the work of the College of Liberal Arts throughout the four-years' course. Details have not yet been received of the courses and specific requirements.

The other event is the acceptance by the University of Iowa of work in Speech as a major for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

These are signs of the times. They have tremendous significance. They ought to be of peculiar interest to those who look upon speech training as a matter of teaching one or two courses in public address and the interpretation of literature, tucked away in a corner somewhere, without facilities, encouragement, or academic standing. To the whole profession, though, they will be of interest as indicative of a new spirit and a realizable hope. To college and university administrators they will serve as evidence of the sincerity with which the educational world has set itself to remedy the sad neglect of decades in the teaching of the most fundamental and universal subject of all education—the mother tongue as spoken language. Let the news be spread.

HOW WE CONDUCT OUR CLASSES

AT a gathering recently of teachers of Speech the suggestion was made that what we needed in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL was more articles showing how teachers conduct their classes and outline their work. The idea met with instant and general approval.

In this number we have three such articles, giving specific information as to how teachers solve class problems. These articles will undoubtedly be seized upon with welcome by teachers everywhere wishing to get new ideas. More of the same kind will get a welcome equally enthusiastic. There is probably no other subject in

the curriculum that lends itself to so many ways of approach and method as Speech. That is one of the results of its extreme primacy in the hierarchy of educational subjects; being most liberal in kind, it can be handled in the most liberal of fashions.

But it does not thrive on mere individualistic eccentricity; there are definite best ways of teaching voice, directness of expression, platform deportment, argumentation, team debating, persuasion, dramatics—all the numerous subjects that make up the field. No one person is ever likely to think up all these best ways. Yet someone somewhere is using them, probably unaware that his method would interest and help others. If he will but put it in circulation, it can do a world of good. If he keeps it to himself, it helps him only. Of such is not the kingdom of education.

So embolden yourself to believe that you have worked out some technique, some bit of class procedure, some device or method or class plan will be worth something to somebody else; then send it to the QUARTERLY JOURNAL for the new section, *Notes from the Class Room and the Laboratory*. It need not be long or elaborate; just clear. A little cooperation here will help not only individuals but the whole cause of effective teaching of Speech.

EMPHASIS ON SILENT READING—A MENACE?

THE faddist has broken out again. This time he is the school superintendent who bravely proclaims that he has found a new emancipation for his charges; he is going to free them from the drudgery and waste of oral reading and will henceforth place the emphasis in schools upon reading silently from the page. He makes it sound very plausible.

But there is something loose about the logic behind this purpose; rather, in the perceptions of the man who makes observations that lead to such a conclusion. It is not difficult to believe that the man who so decides to seal the fate of his charges belongs to the rather surprisingly large group of men in educational prominence who have all the marks of rating low in ability to discriminate with the ear. Having ears they hear not. At least they hear most imperfectly. To them all speaking and reading sounds alike. They are unaware of any problem of excellence or weakness in what they hear from readers and speakers.

On no other hypothesis can one explain how school superintendents can talk of abolishing, or cutting down, oral reading. We could understand it if they were reducing the reading to make way for speaking. But, no; they are going to substitute rapid silent reading. We are to become a race of goggle-eyed book grubbers. It is not hard to predict that if children during the years when they are forming their speech habits, are compelled to forego the advantage of training in oral reading that they may speed up in silent reading, they will inevitably come out a race of mumblers, lacking in powers of inflection and modulation, weak of voice, indirect, without a sense of rhythm, throaty, dull, and altogether banal; not only in speech but in personality and social deportment.

Can anyone suggest a method of heading off the superintendents before they cause irreparable ruin with their freak ideas?

THE FORUM

MINUTES
EASTERN PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE
1921

THE twelfth annual meeting of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference was held at Princeton on Monday and Tuesday, March 28 and 29, 1921.

Monday, March 28

Morning Session

The Conference was called to order at 10:35 A. M., with the President, D. W. Redmond, C. C. N. Y., in the chair. The following members were then or later in attendance: Messrs. Redmond, Covington, Drummond, Winans, Luch, Rassweiler, Gunnison, Weston, Reeves, B. Smith, Illingworth, Palmer, Schulz, Richardson, Briggs, Collins, Coulton, Hicks, Davison, Thomas, Hudson, Dolman; Misses Couch, Steadman, Everett, Cooney, Avery, Prentiss, Manser, Carll, Latham, Bennett, Pickens; Mrs. Davis.

Address: "College Dramatics and the Community Theatre," by A. M. Drummond, Cornell University.

Address: "The Place of the Play in the College Curriculum," by Miss Marja B. Steadman, University of West Virginia.

Both speakers emphasized the educational value of dramatics. Open discussion largely took the form of questions. Drummond gave astonishing figures on the growth of the community dramatic movement in New York State resulting from the two experiments at the State Fair.

Afternoon Session

Address: "Co-ordination of Speech Training in School and College," by Miss Genevieve Cooney, Murray Hill High School (postponed from the morning session).

Open discussion by Reeves, Miss Cooney, Palmer, Miss Couch,

Mrs. Davis, Redmond, Briggs. Question of college entrance credit for secondary school work. The colleges say the schools should take the lead; the schools say the colleges should. A draw.

The President turned the afternoon session over to the chairmanship of Miss Elizabeth Avery, of Smith College. Miss Avery promised that some gauntlets would be thrown down—ladies' sizes.

Address: "General Presentation; Essentials of a Fundamental Course in the Speech Department," by Miss Azubah J. Latham, Teachers' College, Columbia.

Address: "The Training of the Voice," by Miss Isadella C. Coach, Mt. Holyoke College.

Address: "The Place of Phonetics in Speech Work," by Miss Henrietta Prentiss, Hunter College, New York.

Address: "The Use of Phonetics in the Interpretation of Literature," by Mrs. Estelle H. Davis, Barnard College.

Open discussion by Rassweiler, Miss Prentiss, Mrs. Davis, Miss Cooney, Hicks, Richardson, Briggs, B. Smith, Thomas, Luch, Miss Bennett, Miss Everett, Miss Latham. Discussion largely on the perennial topic of the relative emphasis to be placed upon form and content, and the question of how far to go in seeking a standard of pronunciation. Question of how far to use *conscious* methods in teaching phonetics for speech improvement; Mrs. Davis for the conscious method, Miss Latham against. Generally speaking, the women favored much more emphasis on phonetics and voice than the men.

Evening Session

Address: "Minimum Standards for Speech Training," by Philip M. Hicks, Swarthmore College.

Discussion by Palmer.

Address: "Co-operation Between the Library and the Department of Speech," by Bromley Smith, Bucknell University.

Address: "Can We Modernize the Theory of Invention?" by Hoyt H. Hudson, Cornell University.

Discussion by Redmond and B. Smith.

Mr. Dilman explained the re-organization of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL, and made the annual appeal for both editorial and financial support. President Redmond endorsed the appeal.

It being evident that weariness and not discussion was in the air, the meeting adjourned at 9:30.

TUESDAY, MARCH 29

Business Session

Meeting called to order by President Redmond at 9:05 A. M.

Minutes of the 1920 business meeting read and approved.

Report of the Treasurer read and approved. At the request of the Treasurer, Mr. Altmaier, of Drexel, was appointed as an Auditing Committee.

Committee on Time and Place reported in favor of Easter Monday and Tuesday for the 1922 Conference, and the University of Pennsylvania as the place. Report adopted; but later it was moved, seconded and carried that in the event of the National Association holding its next Convention in the East, the Executive Committee be empowered to arrange a joint meeting as its own discretion.

The same committee reported a resolution of regret touching the illness of Professor H. W. Smith, and of appreciation of his many kindnesses to the Eastern Conference. Unanimously carried.

The same committee further reported a resolution thanking Professor Covington and his Princeton associates for this year's hospitality. Unanimously carried.

Committee on Nominations reported the following slate:

For President: John Dolman, Jr., Pennsylvania.

For Vice-President: Bromley Smith, Bucknell.

For Secretary-Treasurer: Miss Elizabeth Avery, Smith.

For Member-at-Large, Ex. Com.: Daniel W. Redmond, C. C. N. Y.

Report adopted, and the nominees declared elected.

Business meeting adjourned, 9:25 A. M.

Morning Conference Session

Address: "Practical Phonetics, Part II," by J. Duncan Spaeth, Ph.D., Princeton University.

Open discussion, largely in the nature of questions.

Address: "The Speaker's Attitude of Mind," by Wilfred E. Davison, Dean in Middlebury College.

Open discussion by Palmer, Richardson, Weston, Miss Avery, Schulz, Luch, Mrs. Davis, Davison.

Address: "Problem in Teaching Debate," by G. Rowland Collins, New York University.

Open discussion by Miss Bennett, Winans, Collins, Miss Avery, Rassweiler. Question of whether or not emotion should be regarded

as foreign to debate. Question of whether or not debating as a student activity should have faculty guidance.

The retiring President introduced the incoming President.

Resolution of thanks to the retiring officers. Carried.

Resolution of good will to the new editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL. Carried.

Adjournment, 12:45 P. M. J. D. JR.

THE DECISIONLESS DEBATE WITH THE OPEN FORUM

THE universities of the Middle West have been trying a new solution of the problem of the debate judge. They have tried abolishing him altogether. Much interest is evinced as to their conclusions. In order to give the readers of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL the benefit of the experience of the past year, the editor has asked representatives of six universities to record their conclusions up to date of the workings of the new scheme and of their attitude toward the change.

The letter addressed to these men asked the following nine questions:

1. Does it (the system of doing away with judges and the decision, and the substitution of a half-hour's open forum) bring out an interesting public discussion?

2. Does the debate lose any interest for the audience?

3. Does it produce a more frank discussion?

4. Is anything of value lost in not having a decision?

5. Does it produce a more typical kind of public discussion; less formal, more sparkling, allowing more wit and humor?

6. Does the audience show interest in the open forum?

7. Are there noticeable changes in the manner of speaking and presenting material?

8. Is the clash of opinion more assured under this system?

9. Is not this kind of discussion much more in line with what young men will encounter in after life, especially outside of the court room?

Replies have been given as follows:

Northwestern

Professor J. L. Lardner, for Northwestern: "We have had one judgless debate at Northwestern. This is not sufficient experience upon which to base a final judgment; we can report only impressions up to date. Two things are clear with us: first, the students do not like the judgeless feature; and second, they do like the open forum following the debate proper. They want to win, and without this possibility of victory they feel that a certain zest and enthusiasm is lost. I believe that the student body did have less interest in the contest, but I do not believe that this was true of the men on the team.

"There was less nervousness, less excitement; but more poise, ease, and control than our debaters have shown in the past. They want the open forum in which questions are fired at them to answer, because they enjoy the grapple with the man from the audience. And, indeed, this was very interesting, and very illuminating in our debates. It was an excellent test of the debater's knowledge of the question and of his real extemporaneous ability. All want the open forum whether the debate is judged or not."

Professor L. R. Sarett also speaks for Northwestern. His reply may be summed as follows: The new system brings out an interesting public discussion, if the question is a "live" one. The debate loses somewhat in interest for the audience; they want a decision. The scheme produces a more frank discussion. What is lost is "the snap of competition, rivalry, combat. Also strategy in debate." It produces a more typical form of public discussion; less formal, more sparkling, allowing for wit and humor. The audience shows interest in the open forum when the question is a "live" one. There are no noticeable changes yet in the manner of speaking, but there will be. The clash of opinion is more assured under this system. To the question, Is not this kind of discussion more in line with what young men will encounter in after life, he replies, "Decidedly." And finally he adds: "The debaters want a decision—*plus* the open forum."

Iowa

Professor Glenn N. Merry, for the University of Iowa:

IOWA and Nebraska were the first universities in the Middle West to try ou the judgeless-forum debate system. We got our idea from a debate held at the University of Minnesota in which a de-

cision was rendered by the usual three judges but after which a discussion was held in which the audience was allowed to participate. Such a system had been suggested there by Prof. Albert Olmstead of the Extension Division. He had just come to the University of Minnesota from Boston where he had been in touch with the forum type of public meeting. The Iowa debaters enjoyed that type of debate so well that they returned to the University with an enthusiasm to see it repeated. This was in the year just after the War. The treasury of the student organization which finances debate and oratory was low. At once we conceived the idea of eliminating judges and thereby saving the usual heavy expense attached to intercollegiate debating. Furthermore, there were fundamental grounds of an educational nature, which appealed to me as strongly recommending the elimination of judges in the debates that year. Prof. M. M. Fogg, of the University of Nebraska, had served as a judge in our December debate. At that time I arranged with him a debate in which we were to eliminate the judge. He was very enthusiastic over the idea of giving the plan a trial and went a step farther suggesting the elimination, in so far as was practicable, the coaching. In this fashion a type of debate would be presented which was largely the outgrowth of the students' own development, ability, and interest. It was necessary for us to hold the debate at Iowa the evening before the debate at Nebraska. It was my privilege therefore to hear both debates. They were an unqualified success. The Governor of Nebraska presided at the Lincoln debate and expressed himself as being most favorable toward this new type of public discussion. Our own debaters liked the plan and have voted to continue it this year. I have given this brief history of our relationship to this type of debating as a matter of record.

Speaking for our interest here, I believe in the judgeless-forum type of debating, for the present. I should not want to bind myself to it for any greater length of time than the immediate. Just what development this type of debating will take is quite an uncertainty. There are two features which stand out clearly with reference to this type of debating which may make or break it as an intercollegiate institution.

First, there is the spirit to deal with among undergraduate students which has in the past stimulated intercollegiate debating as a sport. Intercollegiate debating has paralleled athletics somewhat. It

has been the dominant purpose of college students to desire to win. Just as it has been a pleasure to defeat a neighboring institution in basketball or football, so a similar rival pleasure grew up in debating. If it were possible to defeat an institution in debate which regularly had been the conqueror in football the pleasure became all the more intense. But a just victory is much more easily determined in athletics than in debate. No debate coach is free from the experience of returning with the victorious team to the community which receives him with open arms. This glamor is firmly established in the minds of undergraduates and is the chief foe, as I see it, to the new type of debating. Will students be willing to form a new conception of the sport phase? Are they capable of seeing the broader educational value of the new type of debating? Can the ideal be built up in the minds of students of working at a debate for the sake of making creditable presentations of argument on a public question without the stimulus of a favorable decision as a taken of victory? The one appeal to which I have found debaters susceptible is a very vivid memory of some intercollegiate debaters and of some coaches of returning to their institutions without the decision, of returning in defeat. It has grown to be quite a custom for the defeated debaters to think that decisions do not amount to much anyway. My chief appeal to our debaters has been based upon a recent debate between the Universities of Minnesota and Wisconsin. At this occasion three public speaking teachers were present as judges, Professor Woolbert, Professor Hollister, and myself. The judges differed. If teachers of debate differ upon a debate decision, what might be expected of the laymen? The judge who dissented from the two votes was just as firm in his conviction as were the two with whom he differed. My debaters have seen this point and have felt that after all the chief thing to work for was not a *decision* of three judges, solely.

Second, the big feature about the judgeless-forum type of debate is the fact that it is built upon sound educational principles. After all, intercollegiate debating is held to inform the public upon a question which is a living issue at the time of the debate, and to give training to the debaters in collecting and expressing the arguments used. What better type of education could there be than the type in which college men who are supposed to be the coming leaders of society present an array of arguments to an audience? For these

debaters to have in mind a decision from three judges, oftentimes distorts their conceptions of methods of appeal. In actual life the usual type of judged intercollegiate debating is not apt to be found, except in the case of a highly technical plea before a court judge. The type of debating in which the debater talks to the whole audience and takes the group mind as that to which he must appeal, is a much more common type of speaking. I am not aware that it is a good policy on the part of any speaker before an audience to talk to an individual mind solely, and yet there is a great deal to be said on the other side of any such proposition. If the outstanding purpose in the minds of the debaters before the debate is to win a decision, I have found that the debaters are chiefly *nervous* and devoted to a type of reflection as to how they can *win* the judges. On the other hand with the forum type of debating I have found the debaters before the discussion to be entertaining the idea of how they can interest the audience, how they can make their talk appeal to those present and how they can substantiate their points should any person from the audience attack the arguments.

Then, it has been my observation that for the forum type of debating the debaters prepare much more carefully. Under the old system a debater knew that he had a time limit and that he could slide over a point for which he did not have sufficient evidence, if the opposing team did not challenge him. But with the new type of debating the speaker must know specifically something about every principle he advocates and have evidence that will appeal as conclusive to any questioner in doubt. And then, too, the type of speaking is far more real. The debaters are talking to an audience; they can introduce illustrations and even humor or sarcasm without the fear of losing a decision from the incompetent judge who may be prejudiced because of such an appeal. The debater must be upon his mettle. He must be ready in a straightforward, conversational manner to answer any question that may come from the audience. There can be no "canned" speeches or rebuttals in answering these questions. If we are to grant the point that judges are perfect, I should favor much more the old type of debating. But I have found such insignificant facts to fix a decision on the part of some judges that I have grown to feel a judge to be quite a finite individual filled with possibilities for error. The new type may develop errors of a much more grave nature than the old type and I am committed to it only for the present.

There are by-products of the judgeless-forum type of debate which appeal very strongly in our community. It is the fact that this type of debate is much more interesting and appealing to the average student audience than the old type. The old type of debating was becoming less and less interesting to our student body. It was becoming a difficult matter to get out an audience. However, we have found little or no difficulty with the new type. And, then, there is a tendency for this type of debating to place great emphasis where it should be placed, namely, on the *discussion* of a public question. It is generally a fine thing for an audience to be allowed to participate in any such discussion. It is the true spirit of public education. It is the greatest opportunity in public speaking, to the minds of many, for the college man.

MICHIGAN

Professors T. C. Trueblood, R. D. T. Hollister, and R. K. Immel, for the University of Michigan: The members of our department have been talking over the questions that you sent out under date of March 26th, and we herewith make answer to them. These statements represent the department opinion of Michigan rather than the opinion of any one member of the department.

Number One: There seems to be no difference between the judgeless debate and the judged debate, so far as "interesting public discussion" is concerned.

Number Two: There seems to be no question but that the judgeless system represents a distinct loss of interest for the audience. Our students are still under the influence of the old time debate with the excitement incident to the judges' decision, and they seem to feel a distinct loss with the removal of that excitement. So far as the debate itself is concerned it seemed to be listened to just as attentively and with just as much interest as before.

Number Three: As for frankness of discussion, we can see no difference in the two styles of debate. The discussion is still a debate, so far as we can see, and not a forum. Each side tries as hard as formerly to put forward its best arguments.

Number four: So far as the debate itself is concerned, nothing of value seems to be lost in not having a decision. The debates are as well prepared and as well given as before. The incentive of making a good clear case for one's side seems to be as strong as it was under the old system. Of course, if it should turn out that

public interest is lost, something of value is lost. It is too early to judge of this as yet.

Number Five: We can see no difference in formality or in the use of wit or humor between the two systems.

Number Six: Nearly half of our audience left at the conclusion of the debate. Those who remained showed very active interest in the open forum.

Number Seven: There is possibly a greater attempt under the judgeless system to present material so that it will be interesting to the average layman in the audience. The speaking is not quite so hurried and the speakers are not under quite so great mental strain under the new system.

Number Eight: We see no difference in the clash of opinion under the two systems.

Number Nine: So far as we can see the debates are not essentially different under the two systems with the exception of the open forum which could be made a feature of either system.

We believe that the judgeless debates have not had a long enough trial to justify a final judgment as to their value. At least two or three years will be necessary to determine whether the judgeless feature is an asset or a liability. If public interest can be sustained in the judgeless debate, we are for the retention of the system. It eliminates the necessity and expense of getting judges and it accomplishes all that a judged debate could hope to accomplish. It has the effect of putting students more at their ease, of promoting a calmer, more sensible and more reasonable presentation of the case and it puts emphasis where the emphasis belongs, namely on the debate itself and not on the mere outcome of the debate. In our judgment, the whole matter hinger on the effect which the new system may have on public interest.

MINNESOTA

Professor F. M. Rarig, for the University of Minnesota: The absence of judges had no appreciable effect on the Illinois-Minnesota debate. The prediction that the speakers would not be so well prepared and that their work on the platform would be wanting in spirit did not come true. Some of them were as nervous, and all were as eager to gain acceptance for their arguments as if there had been judges. It was true that both debaters and audience seemed at times to make more or less conscious efforts to adjust themselves

to the fact that, after all, there was to be no decision. The net result may be described, first, as a somewhat uneasy mental relaxation from the tense expectancy of the traditional debate and, second, as a gradual refocussing of interest and attention on the issues and the merits of the arguments. During the discussion, the audience put short and pointed questions, which the debaters answered with general satisfaction. Some of the answers represented attempts to continue the debate, but those which stated facts impartially seemed to make the better impression. Professor Woolbert's clearly explained plan for the discussion, as well as his animated conduct of it, enlisted the active co-operation of the audience and effectually forestalled any monopoly of the discussion by a few.

It is doubtful whether college debaters can be safely encouraged to use humor, as it is liable to become trivial and detract from the seriousness of the discussion. This debate was not made distinctive by any unusual sharpness of wit, although it is true that the questions and answers went back and forth in an atmosphere of much good humor. Some responses produced mirth without failing to suggest pointed criticisms. In response to a request for evidence in support of an important assertion, one debater read some rather general evidence from a book and then asked, "Is that definite—enough?" "No, it's not definite," replied the questioner, "but it's enough."

Our debaters were very much pleased with their experiences in their first judgless debate followed by open forum discussion, and the favorable comment after the debate was pretty general. But there are questions. Will such debates hold the interest of candidates for teams, or will the number of such candidates gradually diminish? Will the members of our university communities continue to attend such debates? Will the absence of a decision actually do away with partizanship, or will students insist that their team was superior? Is there any substitute for a decision as a means of stimulating one team, at least, to make a careful review and criticism of the debate? Would it not be well to have a decision based on both the debate and the answers to questions? These questions can doubtless be answered favorably to the discussion debate when we have interested our students in issues and evidence rather than victories and have worked out a definite method of procedure for the guidance of chairmen.

Professor C. F. Lindsley, for the University of Minnesota: I believe that the judgeless, open-forum debate is a hopeful experiment; but I recognize it for just that—an experiment. Being cognizant of the fallacies of generalization I refrain from making unreserved commitments on this subject, but I am glad to set down what seem to be the results of two judgeless, open-forum debates at the University of Minnesota. I shall speak of the experiment from the viewpoint of the debater and the audience.

Our debaters prepared for these contests with as much energetic zeal as in former years, and at no time expressed the sentiment, "Oh, well, we can't lost anything." However, I attribute this partly to the fact that all the men were trained and experienced debaters and were motivated by intellectual seriousness. I cannot claim that there was any marked difference from the usual manner of organizing and presenting material, for the speeches preserved their ordinary phonographic character; but the answers made to questions asked by the audience revealed much more freedom and originality. Speakers answered questions impartially and with mental detachment.

The reaction of the audience at these debates was the most encouraging evidence of their success. The debates had been advertised, of course, as open-forum debates, and students came armed with ideas and questions which they discharged at the debaters so rapidly that the Chairman had difficulty in knowing whom to recognize. One man drew from his pocket a heavy manuscript and attempted to read it. The foreign students present (we were debating the policy of Japanese Exclusion by national law) made interesting and valuable contributions to the discussion. All questions were asked and answered in a fine spirit of mutual frankness and not in the spirit of heckling or partisanship. Certain it was that these debates aroused more public discussion that any debates of the past, and after the debates were closed students stood around in groups and seemed loath to quit talking.

The judgeless, open-forum debate is, indeed, a wholesome experiment but the plan of open forum discussion after the debate will, I believe, receive wide recognition.

Illinois

Professor C. H. Woolbert, for the University of Illinois: The University of Illinois is divided on the new method; the students, particularly as represented in the daily student paper, oppose it; but

those who have to do the work of debate are heartily in favor of it, including the majority of the debaters. There is no issue over the forum feature, everybody seems to have good words for that. The issue is on the abolition of the judges and all forms of a decision. The students have the bleacher idea and no more. They have not thought the thing through; they only know that they suffer a loss to which they are not adjusted. In particular the newspaper men object because it spoils a good story. There is a news item in the fact that three men from Illinois talked over a matter of public interest with three men from Michigan last night, but not nearly of the value of the announcement that our team won or lost. I think this accounts entirely for the attitude of students.

I am convinced that here is the solution of the problem of contest slavery that curses so many teachers of Speech. The number of colleges in which a teacher's job depends upon his ability to win debates is appalling. It is increasing rather than diminishing. It is high time that any device or arrangement that will free men and women from this frightful drudgery, be found and adopted. Then teachers of Speech will have time and energy for those activities that make for scholarship and academic dignity.

I second everything that has been said in favor of this method in the preceding statements. I would like to be free of judges forever. I am so strong in this that I am willing to risk the displeasure of the students and to stand a considerable period of educating audiences into looking upon debate with a new insight into what it is and ought to be. I have heard two of these judgeless debates, and both were more interesting than any I had ever heard before; more clash, more direct speaking, more honest handling of the issues and of the facts; less covering up, less evading, less fear, and more fun. It is a travesty on fair instruction to hold up as typical for American audiences and speakers the heavy, fear-laden, humorless, evasive speaking and handling of evidence that has characterized debate in all too many cases in the past. I have the confidence to believe that students can be made to see that there is more dignity in the new method, and just as much interest. My feeling is that the sporting love of a victory is all right for schools. I am not ready to recommend the abolition of the judges for high schools; I think it has a place there. But I have long felt that there is a loss of something valuable to put so much emphasis in college training upon what three

men—or one man—say about the debate. The audience always has their own opinion anyway, and are never convinced by what the three men happen to say. And that is the way the great American public always passes judgment.

So I think the system worthy of more experimentation and refinement. It looks to me like a step forward, and a long one.

WISCONSIN

Professor J. M. O'Neill, for the University of Wisconsin: I have heard three open forum debates without judges this season. My feeling, at the present time, is that these debates are tremendously worth while. So far as our Wisconsin squad is concerned, this year we could observe no letting down in effort or enthusiasm or size of audience. I believe that our debates were at least as well prepared as in years when we had judges; I believe that the men on the platform, in the actual debate, talked with more freedom and more enthusiasm, and I further had a feeling that the audiences were enjoying these debates this year more than they seemed to enjoy others. The size of the audiences was larger than at most of the other debates we have had here.

It should be said, however, that many of the debaters have expressed a preference for a decision debate, notwithstanding the lively spirit and good times which they have had in the judgless debates.

I feel that the system is worth a thorough trial, such a trial as cannot be given in one season. It seems to me that it would be well to try this open forum system for three or four years, in order to come to a college generation unfamiliar with decision debates, and therefore not dependent upon the idea of winning or losing for a considerable part of its interest and enthusiasm. Before I shall be willing to make a final decision that the open forum judgless debate should supplant the decision debate as we have known it in recent years, I want to be convinced that students in judgless debates will regularly prepare as thoroughly and debate as keenly as they would do under the old system. It will take time to tell this.

In two of the debates I heard this year, the open forum at the end was conducted on the basis of oral questions pronounced on the floor of the house by members of the audience rising and asking questions so all could hear. One of the debates was conducted on the basis of written questions, gathered up by ushers and carried to the platform. In my opinion, the latter method should never be

used. There is a lack of personality behind the question. There is a temptation to take too much time to sort the questions and assign them to the speakers, and also a temptation for the debaters to take too much time to prepare their answers. To get the most out of this form of debate, the open forum should be started immediately at the end of the regular debate, and questions and answers should follow rapidly, without the slightest waiting or hesitation on the part of the debaters. So conducted, I believe the open forum debate has much to offer that cannot be obtained in the debate with judges. Whether or not, on the other hand, it loses some of the good things which attended the old form, seems to me to be a question not yet settled. On the basis of my observations of three debates this year, I should say that much is gained and nothing lost. But I realize that three instances are hardly sufficient for establishing such a generalization.

Professor A. T. Weaver, for the University of Wisconsin:

1. If the questions to be debated are selected with particular attention to their inherent interestingness, and if the presiding officer is resourceful and expert in starting and keeping the ball rolling, I feel that an interesting public discussion is very nearly assured.

2. As to whether or not the debate loses interest for the audience, I believe that we shall find our only valid answer in our success or failure, over a considerable period of time, in getting audiences. If the experiment succeeds here, it will have justified itself.

3. In the debate which came under my observation, I think that there was a noticeable increase in the frankness of the discussion. This was especially true in the open-forum following the debate itself. It was extremely pleasing to hear some of the debaters retract ill supported assertions and modify exaggerated statements, under questioning from the audience.

4. I can think of nothing of value which has been lost in not having a decision. Of course if we eventually lose thoroughness of preparation on the part of the debaters or interest on the part of the audience the situation would be serious. Thus far neither of these catastrophes has become a menace to our debate work here. Our forensic board charged admission for a judgeless debate here this year and had as large a crowd as we have had in recent years for any intercollegiate debate, although the debates have always been open to the public without charge heretofore, and notwithstanding the fact

that the no decision plan was thoroughly advertised in advance. So far as the preparation of the debates is concerned, we have two teams at work now on the same question; one to debate under the old plan and one under the new—so far the team which is to enter the no decision contest has been working more faithfully than the other. The desire to make a good showing in the open forum compensates for the lack of a decision.

5. In the debate which I heard there was considerable of the old rigid formality left although there was a distinct tendency to introduce more wit and humor.

6. In the case I observed the audience showed interest in the open-forum.

7. A little more freedom in various ways, and more attention to the audience. Less combative and contentious. More courteous and friendly toward opponents.

8. It is not clear to me that the new system makes much difference as to the chances for a more complete clash of opinion.

9. I should say that it is obviously true that this kind of discussion is more typical of actual conditions in life. I do not think that the old contest debate finds a very close parallel in after life even in the court room.

NOTES FROM THE CLASSROOM and LABORATORY

WOOLBERT, CHARLES H. Effects of various modes of public reading. *The Journal of Applied Psychology,* June-September, 1920. Pp. 162-185.

Here is an article worthy of careful reading by every member of the teaching profession in speech education. It is an article of special moment, in that it sets forth a new point of view for getting at principles in speech education and a point of view that is within the interest of every teacher of the spoken word. It is a type of document that we may begin to look forward to with the coming in of experimental work among those interested in research. It represents a step in advance, academically speaking. In so far as I am aware, nothing of the kind, even in general purpose has ever been done; the specific point of the thesis maintained certainly is a distinct contribution. And any chronicle of the development of the technique of class-room methods in speech education must take into consideration the departure of this exposition.

The article is a digest of a thesis prepared by Dr. Woolbert, while a graduate student at Harvard University. The thesis was prepared under the supervision of the Department of Psychology at that institution. The article is so interesting that many of us, no doubt, would be glad if it were possible to peruse the full data. But, although the author was limited as to space available, there is within the twenty pages an ample statement of a bit of research that may set a precedent worthy of note.

The number of teachers interested in getting at more specific information by means of research is growing larger every year. Yet, of this number, there are many who have no clear idea of methods of procedure. Here is a method worthy of careful consideration, for it is a splendid example of the working out of a technique for a problem in which exact definition is next to impossible when con-

sidered from the standpoint of the exact scientist's idea of definition. Two teachers of speech might not agree, possibly, upon the exact meaning of "quality" as an element in emphasis. Yet it is probable that they would not disagree as to a "quality" emphasis, if they should listen to a public reader use such a type of emphasis. They might not be able to define exactly what the emphasis consisted in, yet there would be no mistake in recognizing its use. Should such a difficulty in research discourage the investigator? Dr. Woolbert's feeling in the matter is that it should not. He might argue that the physicist undertands little as to what electricity is exactly, yet this lack of exact information does not bar the physicist from dealing with the behavior of electricity. If there is one thing that the teacher of speech has felt reasonably sure of for generations it has been the knowledge of the importance of the various forms of voice change as a medium for the communication of thought and emotion. With such a well established agreement on usage, Woolbert began his work. His confidence in this point of initial attack is stated on page 162, "Changes in pitch, time, intensity and timbre can be studied as general and total or as finely modulated and of narrow degree. Again they can be studied as affecting individual words, sentences, paragraphs, or larger units of discourse."

The prime purpose of this investigation was two-fold. In the first place "this study is an attempt to bring the numerous problems of oral expression and public reading into the laboratory." In the second place, it was desired to make a measure of the effect of modes of reading and reports were asked from those who acted as "audience":—"the purpose of the reports is to provide a measure of impressiveness of the different modes of reading, and to give this measure in mathematical terms." Such a general purpose of investigation "required a new method with very little precedent as guide." And "the method adopted after many preliminaries was based upon a study of the relation between *changes* in the use of the voice and specified responses of auditors; that is, the effects of various modes of public reading, employing *different combinations of changes* in the use of the attributes of sound while reading. These different combinations offer various *modes of reading.*" Since there has been no investigation under laboratory conditions that shows a relationship between the constant changes of pitch, time, intensity, and quality as attributes of voice communicating meaning, Woolbert

restricted the series of modes of reading throughout the study to "certain *gross degrees of change* in pitch, time, intensity, and timbre." This is an important point to be noted; it was not the intention of the experiment to determine the nature of voice in these changes, such changes of voice were assumed for the purpose of getting at an altogether different entity, namely, the effects of "various modes of public reading." It must be borne in mind, further, that "the type of change studied here applies to *large units* of discourse, in this case passages of twenty minutes in length." The "attributes of sound as elements of change in reading" seem to me to be merely another manner of stating what is commonly known to teachers of speech as the use of the forms of emphasis in reading. These changes he found were all included by eleven modes of reading.

Mode 1. Median change of all four attributes.
Mode 2. Extreme change of Pitch; Median change of other three.
Mode 3. No change of Pitch; Median change of other three.
Mode 4. No change of Time; Median change of other three.
Mode 5. Extreme change of Time; Median change of other three.
Mode 6. No change of Intensity; Median change of other three.
Mode 7. Extreme change of Intensity; Median change of other three.
Mode 8. No change of Quality; Median change of other three.
Mode 9. Extreme change of Quality; Median change of other three.
Mode 10. Extreme change of all Four Attributes.
Mode 11. No change in any of Four Attributes.

Thus, the preliminary analysis of the problem was made. The next step came in the problems connected with the auditor.

With similar care, all the factors that could be determined which would enter into this presentation of the modes of reading and to the response that would be made by the hearer were analyzed and classified. The passages were read by Woolbert who mastered a technique of reading that would adhere to these "modes of reading" and be sufficiently identical for all meetings with his auditors. The reader eliminated gestures of all kinds and postures that would in

any degree supplement the voice as a vehicle of thought and emotion. At the close of each reading period, the auditors were given blanks containing a set series of "leads," or interrogations, based upon the subject-matter read. It is most interesting to note the explanation of the sources of error found at first by using another type of "report" and how finally the use of the system of "leads" was sought. Selections read were from Russian fiction and all were new to the auditors. Each auditor made out his "report" on the fifth day after the reading. The interrogations of the report were such as could be answered briefly and upon the basis of these answers the report was graded. The basis of grading rested upon a score method previously determined. Thus, in the case of the graded report cited in the article, where perfect would have been 24, the auditor made a grade of 18 or a score of .75. Two readings were offered, one to determine the "effect" on the auditor when the mode of reading was new to him, the other to determine the "effect" with the auditor "adapted to the experiment." The data thus secured is analyzed and presented in tables; both the percentages of scores and graphic pictures set forth the results. A further analysis of the results is discussed under the headings,

I. The Function of Changes in the Use of the Four Attributes of Sound in Oral Reading.

II. Individual Difference in the Responses of Auditors.

From the whole investigation, Woolbert reaches the following conclusion:

1. There is a presumption in favor of using an extreme degree of change in all four of the attributes of sound during speech, especially for the purpose of securing retentiveness over an extended time.

2. The four attributes of sound differ in their effect upon the responses to oral reading.

3. Individuals differ widely in their responses to a given combination of change activities.

4. Auditors tend to become adjusted to unconventional modes of reading.

Subsidiary conclusions, which are not so subsidiary either, are

(a) In intellectual impression (such as this type is) regulation of Pitch changes is significant: a wide range is preferable to no change.

(b) An even rate is superior to a rate excessively broken.

(c) Interference with normal degree of change in Intensity reduces apprehension, retentiveness, or both.

(d) Elimination of changes in Quality (Timbre) is greatly inferior to a wide degree of change.

And finally, the study confirms the generally believed fact that changes in Pitch must characterize effective reading; that changes in Intensity interfered with "so as to affect accentuation," could be assumed to be detrimental to impressiveness; and that changes in Quality represent a factor in communicating emotion, mood, total attitude, etc. Conclusions as to changes in Time call for further investigation.

Would that we could have an elaboration of this same method of careful analysis and regard for error to some of the other features of delivery. Work of this kind is the only solution for the problem of differences of opinion. The *evidence* causing the difference can be located.

Personally, I feel a debt of gratitude to Dr. Woolbert for this work, and I have considerable assurance that I represent but one among many who share this professional regard. A few more words, attempting to point out just what Woolbert accomplishes, and does not accomplish, in this study may be in order. He does not accomplish any definition of exactly what types of voice are the impressive voice. He points out what changes in voice carry meaning best. But he does not describe these in terms other than what one may grasp as a general description. I have no doubt that he could illustrate by speech just what he means by the described types of voice changes were one to have a half an hour with him in conference. But one can hardly call this a defect in the work; it was not Woolbert's purpose to make any such specific study of these items. He had to choose among the many, many problems in speech that lend themselves to study what problem was most vitally connected to his immediate interest, and with that in mind, just what problem could best be worked out in the time allotted. Note it was the *effect* of reading or speaking upon the auditor that was what he purposed to study, rather than a characterization of what the speaker used in the way of voice. In the first paragraph of his article, Woolbert states, "Thus the problem deals with auditory stimulations and with behaivor activities of listeners. The task to

be met is that of finding a method whereby the stimuli can be controlled and receptivity measured; that is, of insuring an adequate description of the effect of the voice of the speaker or reader upon the responses of the auditors."

Some one may inquire as to the value of a work that yields conclusions so much in common with the every-day experience or observation of the class-room. Some one may think to himself that he knew these conclusions already. It is just on this point that Woolbert's intention should be made clear. Woolbert was not seeking to establish a new fact, to present knowledge unknown before. I surmise that many readers of the article will find themselves possessed of this attitude toward Woolbert's purpose. It was a *method* that he was seeking. He was inquiring whether such a method of analysis of auditors as they responded to types of speech, that could be reproduced *in gross* as often as desired, was worth while. The test of the method depended upon the conclusions yielded; if they were in line with common sense there was a value to the method; if they were not so justified, there was a probability that the method was worthless. Hence, the great importance of the fact that his conclusions are such as accord with the general experience of the teacher of speech.

To him who wishes to inquire further as to just what the value is of the method, it may be stated that such a method opens up a broad field of possibilities in the study of the reactions of the auditor to any one or all of the types of speaking. Certainly such a method would bring out a valuable knowledge of technique in the reading of poetry and speech-thought of a highly oratorical nature. Such a method can settle the question as far as the average auditor is concerned of dramatic interpretation of lines in connection with stage settings and lightings. Woolbert's conclusions justify his method; now, you or I may use the method with some confidence that the method will justify the conclusions we find.

Thus the research reported upon in this article presents a splendid prototype for him who wishes to get at specific analysis, definition and measurement in the field of reading.

GLENN NEWTON MERRY,
The University of Iowa.

NEW BOOKS

The Aesthetic Attitude. By HERBERT SIDNEY LANGFELD.*

Speech training continues to levy tribute upon Psychology. There is no teaching of one mind how to influence others without being constantly concerned as to what the mind is and how it works. Accordingly, whenever psychology speaks of new discoveries in the science of mind and human behavior, the teacher of Speech finds himself intrigued. For Speech science the relatively new doctrine of *Empathy* marks a sign-post.

Everyone can recall how his thorax hardens when watching men pole-vault or how his legs tighten when watching the high jump or how his whole body sways in time with the actor balancing on his chair at the top of a pyramid of tables. This is Empathy. Not sympathy; empathy. An understanding of it illuminates many a heretofore dark corner of psychology and behavior. For one thing it is the phenomenon at the very bottom of the doctrine that it is now out of date to speak of Mind *vs.* Body. Empathy shows us that it isn't even Mind *and* Body any more. It is Mind *or* Body, according as you choose your point of view or use the organism of which Mind and Body are but two different manifestations.

All studies dealing with behavior must be concerned with Empathy; most particularly those arts that directly concern the human body: sculpture, painting, dancing, acting, and public speaking. Each of these is in itself a practical application of the law of Empathy. To the teacher of Speech an understanding of this principle has become a prime necessity.

Professor Langfeld's book is what the science of aesthetics has been needing. It makes an invaluable contribution to all those disciplines and studies that rest a foot in part at last on the fundamen-

* Dr. Langfeld is Director of the psychological laboratory at Harvard University.

tals of aesthetic doctrine. It is no exaggeration to say that a knowledge of its teachings has become a necessity to any person who desires to solve problems in Speech. Surely nothing of interest will be written on the ground-work of such subjects as acting, interpretation and impersonation, and public address that does not reckon on the facts that give this book its background and foundation. It is hereby commended unreservedly as worthy the fairest consideration and most careful study of all teachers of Speech. It ought even to be used as collateral reading.

Speech training is becoming more and more an adventure in truing up the whole organism. More and more clearly is the realization growing upon us that inasmuch as speech is the crowning achievement of man, requiring the most delicate control of the most intricate neuro-muscular systems, a study of it cannot be successful without a study of the whole integrated machine. The standard of excellence set by the French for good acting becomes the gauge of excellence in anything that affects speech; the French demand of their actors that they act *toute d'une piéce.* "All-in-one-piece" behavior is most easily understood when the doctrine of Empathy is clearly apprehended.

This book is the only one known to the reviewer that faces the issues of Empathy squarely and applies them to the various forms of artistic enterprise. A study of it is more than worth while to every person interested in, not only aesthetics as a science, or art as a matter or theory, but the practical application of it to everyday life. C. H. W.

Pieces for Every Day the Schools Celebrate. By NORMA H. DEMING, Principal of Horace Mann School, Minneapolis, Minn., and KATHERINE I. BEMIS, Teacher of English, Franklin Junior High School Minneapolis, Minn. Lloyd Adams Noble, Publisher. Cloth, 349 pages. Price $2.00.

This timely volume contains much new material and constitutes a splendid collection of selections, both prose and poetry, which busy teachers will find appropriate for special day programs and exercises. The selections are of high literary value and will appeal to the young. Appropriate selections have been grouped for the observance not only of the great national holidays, but also for Roosevelt Day, Red Cross Day, Constitution Day, and Mother's

Day. Several pages of short and pointed quotations are added to each group of selections. This will afford material which the busy teacher can assign to pupils who otherwise would not have a part in the prog am of exercises. This book commends itself to principals and teachers and will meet the wide-felt need for new and fresh material which can be used in connection with the celebration of the important annual holidays which the schools celebrate.

Palmer & Sammis' new-old book, *The Principles of Oral English,* appears again from McMillan's press. It is a slender volume in usable form, covering little more than two hundred pages, in print that appeals to the visual-minded.

The authors have a definite purpose; the book has a definite method. The avowed intention of the writers to base their laws upon grammatical analysis has been consistently carried out. The technical part of this text is specific and illustrated with well-chosen examples. The practice declamations, largely descriptive in style, are chosen for the purpose of developing a pleasing, conversational voice. In fact, except for a clear, well-planned chapter on breathing, the physical aspect of delivery does not enter into the plan of the book.

On the whole the method of approach is better suited to students unused to the English language rather than to the usual group of college Freshmen. Rules, rather than principles, are given prominence, and the psychological processes of delivery are neglected for the technical.

J. P. R., Grinnell, Iowa.

PERIODICALS

MAGAZINE ARTICLES OF SPEECH

ANDREW T. WEAVER
University of Wisconsin

CONRADI, EDWARD—"Speech Defects and Intellectual Progress."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 3, pp. 35-38, January, 1912.

MACDOUGAL, ROBERT — "The Child's Speech: The Impulse to Speech."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 3, pp. 423-429, Oct., 1912.

MACDOUGAL, ROBERT — "The Child's Speech: The Mother's Tongue."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 3, pp. 507-513, Nov., 1912.

MACDOUGAL, ROBERT — "The Child's Speech: Speech Without Words."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 3, pp. 571-576, Nov., 1912.

MACDOUGAL, ROBERT—"The Child's Speech: Word and Meaning."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 4, pp. 29-38, Jan., 1913.

MACDOUGAL, ROBERT—"The Child's Speech: The Mastery of the Tongue."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 4, pp. 85-96, Feb., 1913.

GRAY, C. T.—"The Relation of Breathing to Oral Reading."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 4, pp. 39-41, Jan., 1913.

BATEMAN, W. G.—"A Child's Progress in Speech, with Detailed Vocabularies."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 5, pp. 307-320, June, 1914.

BLANTON, SMILEY—"The University of Wisconsin Speech Clinic." Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 7, pp. 253-260, May, 1916.

BLANTON, SMILEY—"A Survey of Speech Defects."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 7, pp. 581-592, December, 1916.

BATEMAN, W. G.—"Two Children's Progress in Speech."—Jr. Ed. Psy., Vol. 6, pp. 475-493, 1915.

BONNIER, P.—"The Voice in Teaching."—Jr. Exp. Ped., Vol. 1, pp. 285-297, June, 1912.

BALLARD, P. B.—"Sinistrality and Speech."—Jr. Exp. Ped., Vol. 1, pp. 298-310, June, 1912.

FONTAINE, ANDRE—"Apprendre ou Comprendre?"—Revue Pedagogique, Vol. 72, pp. 130-136, 1918.

GAY, P. H.—"L'Act d'expliquer les Mots."—Revue Pedagogique, Vol. 71, pp. 163-175, 1917.

SMITH, BERTHA M.—"Correlation of Ability in Reading with the General Grades."—Sch. Rev., Sept., 1919.

SHEPHERD, EDITH—"Some Silent Reading Lessons."—Sch. Rev., Mar., 1920.

DAVIS, SUSAN—"Better Speech for Better Americans."—Sch. Life, Mar. 13, 1921.

GRANT, ERNEST L.—"Health Habits Inculcated Through Speech."—Sch. Life, Jan. 1, 1920.

WILLIAMS, DORA—"Use of the Phonograph in Improving Speech."—Sch. and Soc., May 17, 1919.

ABERNETHY, J. W.—"Why Not Teach Pronunciation."—Sch. and Soc., Jan. 12, 1918.

HEDGES, M. H.—"Creative Teaching." — Sch. and Soc., Jan. 26, 1918.

BRENEISER, STANLEY—"Picture Study and Oral English in One."—The Sch. Arts Mag., Jan. 28, 1921.

LODGE, GONZALES—"Dramatic Interpretation in the Teaching of the Classics."—Teachers' College Record, Vol. 21, No. 3, May, 1921, pp. 217-238.

CRAWFORD, CAROLINE—"Teaching of Dramatic Arts in the Kindergarten and Elementary School."—Teach. Coll. Rec., Vol. 16, pp. 366-383, Sept., 1915.

THORNDYKE, E. L.—"The Measurement of Ability in Reading: Preliminary Scales and Tests."—Teach. Coll. Rec., Vol. 15, pp. 1-67, Sept., 1914.

THORNDYKE, E. L.—"Measurement of Achievement in Reading: Word Knowledge."—Teach. Coll. Rec., Vol. 17, pp. 430-454, Nov., 1916.

PERRIN, ETHEL—"Methods of Interesting School Children in Good Postural Habits."—Mind and Body, Vol. 21, 262 ff.

——— ——— "Aesthetic Free Exercises."—Mind and Body, Vol. 23, p. 24.

——— ——— "Body Training in Schools."—Mind and Body, Vol. 24, p. 48.

BROWN, G. H.—"The Psychology of Grace." — Mind and Body, Vol. 24, p. 197.

BROWN, G. H.—"The Esthetics of Motion."—Mind and Body, Vol. 24, p. 341.

HILDEBRANDT, EDITH L.—"The Balance Between the Mental and the Physical."—Mind and Body, Vol. 24, p. 437.

BRANDENBURG, G. C. and JULIA—"Language Development During the Fourth Year."—Ped. Sem., 1919, pp. 27-40, Vol. 26.

NICE, MARGARET M.—"A Child's Imagination."—Ped. Sem., 1919, pp. 173-201, Vol. 26.

BATEMAN, W. G.—"Papers on Language Development." — Ped. Sem., Vol. 24, pp. 391-398.

NICE, MARGARET M.—"The Speech Development of a Child from 18 Months to Six Years."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 24, pp. 204-243.

RANDOLPH, EDGAR D.—"Conventional Aversions versus Fundamental Errors in Spoken English."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 24, pp. 318-336.

STEVENS, MABEL—"Why Class Work is of Limited Value in the Treatment of Stuttering."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 24, pp. 36-52.

SMITH, LAURA G.—"A Brief Survey of Right and Left Handedness."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 24, pp. 19-35.

BRUMMELER, MARGARET—"The Vocal Treatment of Stuttering."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 25, pp. 97-104.

NICE, MARGARET M.—"Ambidexterity and Delayed Speech Development."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 25, pp. 141-162.

SNYDER, ALICE D.—"Notes on the Talk of a Two-and-one-half Year old Boy."—Ped. Sem., Vol. 22, pp. 412-424.

pp. 280 ff.

LATTA, R.—"Relation of Mind and Body."—Br. Jr. Psy., Vol. 5,

WATT, HENRY J.—"Relation of Mind and Body."—Br. Jr. Psy., Vol. 5, pp. 292 ff.

BARTLETT, F. C.—"Is Thinking Merely the Action of Language Mechanisms?"—Br. Jr. Psy., Article I, Oct., 1920, p. 55.

THOMPSON, G. H.—Same Title—Article 2—Br. Jr. Psy., Oct., 1920, p. 63.

PEAR, T. H.—Same Title—Article 3—Br. Jr. Psy., Oct., 1920, p. 71.

ROBINSON, A.—Same Title—Article 4—Br. Jr. Psy., Oct., 1920, p. 81.

WATSON, J. B.—Same Title—Article 5—Br. Jr. Psy., Oct., 1920, p. 87.

HEAD, H.—"Disorders of Symbolic Thinking and Expression."—Br. Jr. Psy., Jan., 1921, p. 179 ff.